

THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

FEBRUARY, 1860.

---

- ART. I.—1. *Exploration Scientifique de l'Algérie pendant les années, 1840, 1841, 1842.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale—chez M. Gide et J. Baudry, Paris.
2. *Inscriptions Romaines de l'Algérie.* Par M. Leon Renier. Paris, 1855.
3. *Annuaire de la Société Archéologique de la Province de Constantine.* Année 1854, 1855. Paris: A. Leleux.
4. *The Tricolor on the Atlas, or Algeria and the French Conquest.* From the German of Dr. Wagner, and other sources. By Francis Pulszky, Esq. T. Nelson and Sons, London, Edinburgh, and New York, 1854.
5. *Algeria, or the Topography and History, Political, Social, and Natural, of French Africa.* By John Reynell Morrell. London: N. Cooke, 1854.
6. *Indicateur Général de l'Algérie.* Par Victor Berard Alger. Bastide: Libraire Editeur. 1858.
7. *Algiers in 1857.* By the Rev. E. W. L. Davies. Longman and Co. 1858.
8. *La Kabylie* (and other works), par M. le Général Daumas. Paris: Hachette and Cie.
9. *Sketches of Algeria during the Kabyle War.* By H. M. Walmsley, &c., &c. London: Chapman and Hall. 1858.
10. *Four Months in Algeria.* By the Rev. J. W. Blakesley, &c., &c. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co. 1859.

WE blush to admit with what little interest—we had almost said, with what unworthy jealousy—the colonization of Algeria by the French is regarded by the bulk

of our countrymen. Should it fail, who knows how soon another Hayradin Barbarossa may arise, and Algiers become once more the seat of a piracy that baffled the genius of Charles V. in the 16th century, and the navies of Spain and Denmark in the 18th; that exacted tribute, subsequently to the age of Nelson, in some form or other, not only from every maritime power in Europe, but from our independent trans-Atlantic brethren:\* that, finally, arose Hydra-like, from the bombardment inflicted on it by Lord Exmouth in 1816, with the same pestiferous vitality that it had done previously from that of Duquesne under Louis XIV. In the 17th century, 600 Europeans

---

\* The Americans had made periodical presents to the Dey, besides paying a slight tribute up to 1815. The rest may be classed as follows:

1. Those bound to make presents on every change of Consul, which the Dey took care to demand on the slightest pretext.

	Francs.
Portugal ... ..	107,000.
Naples ... ..	do.
Tuscany (exempted from tribute in 1816) ...	133 750.
Spain ... ..	value undefined.
Sweden and Denmark ... ..	do.
England (in virtue of terms concluded by Lord Exmouth after the bombardment) ...	fr. 15,120.

2. Those bound to pay a yearly tribute.

Sweden and Denmark 21,400 fr. (besides a fine of 160,500 fr. every ten years on renewal of treaties).

Portugal ... ..	128,400.
Naples ... ..	do.

Sardinia, Hanover, and Bremen, paid rather more in presents than England. Russia, Austria, Holland, and France, are said to have enjoyed immunity more or less (at least one treaty, that of 1686, had it been observed, ought to have placed England in the same favoured position), but the Baron adds: "*Les puissances, qui ne payent rien, étaient plus exposées que les autres, à des mauvaises querelles, qui se raccommodaient avec des cadeaux: c'est ainsi qu'en 1815 l'envoi du consul de France fut accompagné d'un présent de 100,000 frs.*" Well may he exclaim in conclusion, "On rougit en songeant qu'un nid de pirates a imposé ces insolentes lois à l'Europe pendant plusieurs siècles!"—*L'Algerie par le Baron Baude. Vol. I. p. 363.*



were liberated from a state of slavery by the French Admiral: in the 19th, the whole number of those whom Lord Exmouth sent back to their respective countries, from Tripoli, Tunis, and Algiers, amounted to 3003; and these comprised Italians, Spaniards, Portuguese, Dutch, French, Germans, and English. It was on these shores that the illustrious Cervantes, and the pious Founder of the Sisters of Charity were bought and sold: and it was here that atrocities, which not even the ideal Legree could have surpassed, were perpetrated continually upon free-born Europeans, of whom, in the 17th century, there had been at one time, no less than 35,000,\* and among these, no less than 1500 British subjects.† Can anything be more terrific than the picture which the eloquent author of *Don Quixote* has drawn of the barbarities which surrounded him?

“Although hunger and nakedness made us experience dreadful sufferings, they were light compared to those of some of our friends. Our spirits failed in witnessing the unheard-of cruelties that Hassan exercised in his bagnio. Every day were new punishments, accompanied with cries of cursing and vengeance: almost daily a captive was thrown upon the hooks, impaled, or deprived of sight, and that without any other motive, than to gratify the thirst of blood natural to this monster, and which inspired even the executioners with horror.”

He was himself menaced with similar tortures for attempting to escape from his bondage; but the expectation of a large ransom prevailed in his favour.‡

Those days, we may devoutly trust, have at length passed away never to return. France has not only exacted terrible vengeance for the past, but she has done, and is still doing her utmost, with admirable perseverance, to inaugurate a glorious future for those countries which had so long been the strong-hold of ignorance and of crime. Alas! that commercial jealousies and rival interests,

---

\* Morrell's *Algeria*, p. 91.

† See a copy of the Captives' Petition, with their Case, shewing the barbarities practised on them, presented to both Houses of Parliament, under title 816. m. 11. in the British Museum.

‡ Blofield's *Algeria*, p. 296.

should interpose between civilized nations, and retard, or even frustrate results, in the opinion of all impartial phil-anthropists, the most desirable. All who have visited those Southern shores of the Mediterranean, must admit the immense gain to humanity that has been achieved in the occupation of Algeria by the French. Whatever may have been, or may be still, the faults of their administration, they have at all events put down the Corsair, and made Algeria no less accessible and secure to the stranger, than their own fair country. And yet it took some twenty years to reconcile European Powers, especially England, to their instalment there. Every one, again, that has travelled in Morocco, Tunis, or Tripoli, must admit what a blessing it would be to see those countries governed as Algeria; and yet were Spain or France to take possession of those countries on grounds ever so justifiable, it is not too much to say that, in so doing, they would risk a war with civilized and enlightened England.\* What we cannot, or will not do ourselves, we are unwilling to see done by others; and every advance made by our neighbours, we regard with suspicion, as having a tendency, in some

---

\* It is admitted, on all hands, that Spain has had ample grounds for her recent rupture with Morocco, and for commencing hostilities. Yet Lord John Russell, in a despatch to Mr. Buchanan, dated October 15, 1859, after having already demanded and received assurance that Spain would never occupy Tangiers more than temporarily, says: "You will further state to his excellency, that her Majesty's Government earnestly desire that there may be no change of possession on the Moorish coasts of the straits (i. e. as Mr. B. interprets it in his subsequent note to Senor Collantes, 'the occupation by Spain of the coast *west* of Ceuta,' or as Senor C., in his reply, 'any point on the said coast, which would give Spain a superiority, would be dangerous to the navigation of the Straits.')

A curious demand, indeed, to make on one nation going to war with another! Lord John proceeds, "The importance they attach to this object cannot be overlooked, and it would be impossible for them, or indeed any other maritime power, to see with indifference, the permanent occupation by Spain of such a position on that coast as would enable her to impede the passage of the Straits to ships frequenting the Mediterranean for commercial or any other purpose." Gazette of November 8, 1859.—Pretty much the same explanations were asked and given by the English and French governments in 1830, when France commenced attacking Algiers.

way or other, to prejudice our interests. The balance of power in Europe, forsooth! is made a pretext for retaining the Southern and Eastern shores of the Mediterranean in their pristine barbarism. Perhaps England would be better pleased had the Saracens defeated Charles Martel, or had Ferdinand and Isabella never expelled the Moors. Providence, however, bends nations as well as individuals, to a purpose not their own. There can be no question that France originally did not mean anything more than to avenge the insult offered to M. Deval, her Consul, by Hassan Dey; and though she doubtless intended that the vengeance should be proportionate to the outrage, yet could she have foreseen that the consequences of her act would have cost her upwards of £60,000,000 sterling\* in a quarter of a century, without any suitable returns, and with the issues of the experiment still doubtful, it is highly probable that she would have contented herself with summary reprisals, and not lavished the blood of her chivalrous troops so profusely upon a field where so little glory was to be won. Gradually and insensibly she was drawn into the position which Providence had assigned her, and from which she could not, with honour, recede. Secondary motives conspired in the same direction.

"Algers was regarded as a place for drilling soldiers for the army; for maintaining its progress, and for punishing the republican troops by sending them against the enemy. The government of Algeria served again for getting rid of the military chiefs, that might have become obnoxious to France?"†

Thus, without for a moment intending to revive the deeds, or embody the ends of the Crusaders, she that gave the first king to Jerusalem in the person of the high-souled Godfrey de Bouillon, has likewise been the first to wrest, and we trust now permanently, from the Mahometan yoke, one of the first of those fair lands which Islamism wrested from Christianity. That Spain may be equally successful, in the prosecution of a war equally just, is our devout wish. This it is which lends additional

---

\* We assume Mr. Blakesley's figures to be correct, but rather under the mark than otherwise.

† Pulszky's Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 387.

interest to the conquest of Algeria by the French, and to which our Indian Empire affords no parallel; inasmuch as India had never been previously Christian, like northern Africa. Greece alone presents the same spectacle, and thus Greek and Frank appear once more upon the stage together in the same drama, as in the days of Alexis Comnenus, and of Louis IX.

To be sure there is this grand difference between the two periods,—Europe no longer arms in behalf of the Cross. The spirit of the Crusaders has become a thing of the past, alike with their conquests. For the rights of mankind, and for the rights of nations; for the vindication of compacts or of humanity, for these causes, and for these solely, and yet not even for these rashly and wantonly, will nations involve themselves in a war, the justice whereof can be endorsed by public opinion in the 19th century. Even where conquest, and not merely retaliation or self-defence is the secret or avowed object, it has become a recognized principle that the religion of the minority shall not be interfered with, and that liberty of conscience shall be respected even in the vanquished. Such are the principles which animate the Cabinets of Modern Europe; it remains to be seen what fruit they will bear, and to what criticisms they will be subjected in a future age. And yet, notwithstanding, these two facts are undeniable: 1. That the Greeks, who have been the first people to emancipate themselves from the Turkish yoke, and to regain their own, were likewise the only conquered nation in the East who remained steadfast to their religion; and the French, who have been the first to establish themselves in a portion of those fair lands from which Christianity had been driven by force of arms, led the vanguard of the armies of the Cross against the Crescent in the middle ages. But this they have done now, not only not fighting for religion, but with a determination not to trample upon the religion of the usurpers themselves. Under the French government, the religion of Mahomet is not only tolerated, but supported equally with the religion of Christ. Proselytism, in the ordinary sense of the word, is rigorously forbidden. Christian masters and mistresses instruct the Mahometan youth in all that concerns individual and social life, but on the express terms that they are not to tamper with their faith. Churches and mosques, Christian and Mahometan cemeteries are erected and adorned at the

public cost. In short, the principle is asserted, that every religion shall have fair play, and that if Christianity is eventually to become the religion of all, it must be owing to her own inherent vitality; to the superiority of her precepts over those of the Koran, and to the moral and social regeneration which she, far above all other religions, is capable of effecting in the heart of man. Unbelievers will have the spectacle of her excellence brought before them in the lives of her teachers and professors; and their conversion will be their own free spontaneous act, should it ever take place. But we shall have occasion to enlarge upon these topics elsewhere. There are other interests besides those of religion intimately connected with French colonization on the shores of the Mediterranean. In the first place, how beneficial must it prove to the peace of the continent, that the restless, chivalrous, impetuous, spirit of France, should at length have found a field amply extensive for the exuberance of her aspirations, where at least she may gratify her keen thirst for military achievements, without involving her more phlegmatic neighbours in the miseries of war; and where she herself too may be powerfully allured to lay aside the sword for the ploughshare, and exchange political excitement for commercial enterprize. No country is more alive than France to the responsibility of what she believes to be a high mission assigned to her. She has conquered Algeria to vindicate her honour, but she will continue to hold it for the good of mankind. If her own children decline immigrating thither, she holds out security both of life and property to the civilized nations by which she is surrounded, that they may be induced to come and do so. She tells the Bedouin of the desert, that she has not come to rob and oppress him, but on the contrary, to civilize and protect him from others, no less than others from him. And in proportion as she extends, or renders more permanent her dominion there, in the same proportion she must, of necessity, be influenced by it in her relations elsewhere. With a long line of flourishing colonies on the coast of the Mediterranean, she must feel that she cannot lightly adventure a war with her neighbours, especially with maritime powers, for here it is that they will avenge themselves. Toulon and Cherbourg may suffice to protect France herself from invasion, but what will they avail her when Oran and Algiers, Philippeville, and Bona, are threatened, and

when secret engagements are entered into with the native population in their rear? Besides, if these colonies are to prosper, their trade, and that of France through them, must be ever on the increase, to a degree perhaps incredible in the present aspect of things, with all other commercial nations. In the present state of decrepitude of the Turkish empire, it is impossible to calculate upon any great development of commercial activity, beyond what already exists in the far East; and if the sick man's death is to be followed by the wars which have been foretold, who can say how long it may be before commerce will revive, even to the extent to which it is now carried on in those parts? Meanwhile Algeria has got the start; she has already gone through the rough work; she is ploughed for the sowing; any body who feels inclined may set up his farm, and commence operations, in any one of her vast plains, secure not only of the protection, but of the active co-operation of the authorities. Roads have been made—admirable roads to the very confines of the desert. Telegraphs bring Algeria within speaking distance of the mother-country; railways and harbours are in progress; land is readily conceded; wells have been sunk; marshes drained; trees, plants, animals have been acclimated: a vigilant police, European and native (to say nothing of the standing army) organized. All that a strong and intelligent government can do, has been, and will continue to be, done both for the assistance of the colonist in his labours, as well as for his defence against overt violence. If individuals rely too much upon a government that takes so much weight from off their shoulders, the fault is theirs; if that government lays too many restrictions upon individual enterprise, let it at least have praise for the numerous difficulties which it removes from his path. If, in some respects, French colonists sigh for the unshackled freedom and independence in which English colonists are left by their government, there are at least some points in which English colonists would be greatly helped forward in their undertakings by the more powerful, because more concentrated, and more impartially directed, arm of the government. Who can, indeed, prophecy what the future commerce of Algeria will be? “Experiments have sufficiently established the fact that, as regards soil and climate, the coast of Algeria could supply Europe with all the staple articles imported now



from the Southern States of the North American Union.”\* Native labour, or “a denser European population,” is the main desideratum. Now that the Kabyles have been thoroughly subdued, however, it remains to be seen whether they can be induced, generally, to work for their conquerors,—as of their hardy industrious qualities there can be no dispute. Besides, it is possible, that, by expanding gradually towards the interior, the French may one day find the means of opening communications between Beled-el-Iereed, and Mabrouk and Timbuctoo, in reference to which a curious native itinerary has been translated and published.† There, that is, in the two latter places, cotton grows in abundance, cultivated by a Negro population. Here, again, are chances of a wide opening for Algerian commerce. How soon may not Algiers become the great Mediterranean emporium of cotton and coffee, cochineal and indigo, tea, and the sugar-cane? Corn, indeed, and tobacco, can be already supplied, in vast quantities, and of the best quality, from her shores. Dates are one of the principal sources of revenue to the government; grapes grow to a size, and in profusion, unknown in Europe; the olive thrives luxuriantly; peach, orange, citron, almond, pomegranate, and banana trees, yield abundantly. Forests there are of oak, and of cedar; mines of iron, lead, copper, zinc, and mercury; marble quarries, and mineral springs, are not wanting. Perhaps the best coral fishery in the Mediterranean is off La-Calle. Every variety of the chase is to be found in the interior. Bright flowers, many-coloured, and sonorous birds, and insects; oriental costumes and physiognomies; a glowing sky, a transparent atmosphere, and, above all, one of the healthiest climates in the world, as is curiously enough demonstrable from antiquity.‡ All this too, within 48 hours of Marseilles and of France, combine to inspire a general European interest in Algeria, which is felt in common by the merchant, and the man of pleasure, by the Christian philanthropist, and by the

---

\* Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 384.

† *Annuaire de la Province de Constantine*, 1853. p. 92.

‡ Not merely the “*plerosque senectus dissolvit.....Nam morbus haud sæpe quenquam superat,*” of Sallust, but from the longevity marked on the old Roman tombstones.



sportsman. Then, lastly, what antiquarian interest is attached to the Numidia of the old Romans? It was once the granary of their wealth; it is still more fertile than any other country in monuments of their grandeur and indomitable perseverance. There they lie, side by side, with aboriginal, as in our own island with Druidical, remains: only, with us, in shapeless masses, and well nigh effaced; there, in a vast number of instances, almost entire, and in some, even restored. It was the old Roman wall that gave the French artillery so much trouble in the siege of Constantine; it is the gigantic Roman cistern, skilfully repaired by the French, that supplies the modern town of Philippeville with water. It is the boast of the French that they are daily founding new cities, upon sites once inhabited by the lords of the known world, though in so doing, by the way, they have been occasionally betrayed into worse Vandalism than the Vandals themselves. And, by a curious coincidence, the ancient city of Lambesa, with a prætorium abounding in relics of the third legion, was disinterred by the third foreign legion under Colonel Carbuccia.

Reverting to Christian antiquities, what can be more touching than the simple inscription still legible on a rock near Constantine, in honour of a number of poor Christians, whose names are given, who were martyred there, probably A. D. 259, under Valerian? \* It is the more affecting, because, in the subsequent persecution under Diocletian, the Bishop of Cirta is said to have played the part of a traitor. So short a time, even in those days, did it take a church to degenerate! †

Then again, at Bona there are not only the remains of the actual cathedral of S. Augustine, but the identical tank or reservoir for rain-water, constructed by order of that renowned prelate, just before the fatal siege of Hippo commenced. At a small watering-place, not a modern, but a Roman one, near Cherchell, named Tipasa, stands a sweet little church—only wanting a roof to be still available—and with the old cross lying on the ground, on the

---

\* The grounds are stated, *Annuaire de la Province de Constantine*, 1853, p. 79: and also a facsimile of the inscription.

† *Ibid.* No. for 1855, where the inventory of the Church property then given up, is printed at length.

south side of it, in which he may well be supposed to have preached; while the adjacent cemetery may contain the tombs of his auditors, which, when opened, disclose skeletons still in the very posture in which they were consigned to their parent earth. Here are sights to which we may again refer, for the Christian as well as the mere antiquarian. Have we not said enough to inspire interest for a country in so many respects so favoured, in one respect so unique in what it offers? India may present her temples and her idols, but we are unacquainted with their history. Here are living records of a nation whose literature forms our childhood's study, whose spirit we think we have inherited, whose Christianity we embody in our daily life.

Now what has France done since she assumed possession of this favoured territory? how far has she pushed civilization, and upon what principles? what have been her successes, her failures, her experiments? what are her future prospects? It would only be fair to premise this enquiry by a candid enumeration of the difficulties against which she has had to struggle. First, then, it is not a single nationality with which she has been brought into contact, or one that, like the aborigines of America, or of Australia, is likely to die out before the new settlers; or one whose religion was derived from the darkness of ancient heathenism, and had never previously been confronted by the light of the Gospel. Six separate nationalities are comprised between Nemours, on the western, and La-Calle on the eastern coast, between the broad chain of Atlas in the centre, and the Belad-el-Ierid, or Koble of the south; and not one of these can be made to amalgamate thoroughly with their neighbours, or be at peace with their neighbours, or be dealt with in one uniform manner. Of these, of course, the Jew offers the least difficulty; yet such is the contempt which this unfortunate stranger, though naturalized and acclimated people, is held by the votaries of Islam, that their good will brings with it no pledge for the peace of the country, and their kindly treatment is interpreted as a sign of weakness or sordid avarice. The five races which remain are connected, it is true, by the bond of religion, but this, while it unites them as one man against aliens from the faith, is of little service to their conquerors in the settlement of the country, when those conquerors are aliens. In fact it forms a solemn

instinctive compact, always in force, gaining rather than waning in intensity from their progressive advance, for their expulsion at the first favourable opportunity. The Turks, being Mahometans themselves, might amalgamate more or less with Arabs, Moors, Kabyles, or Mozabites indifferently : or without amalgamating they might play one or more against the rest, without having any common tie, and that of the strongest nature, to contend against. Either therefore the French must convert these races, for they cannot adopt their religion ; or else they must force them to emigrate into the wilderness, or beyond the sea, otherwise they will never get over the difficulty. It will be always there, dormant, it may be, for years, but ready to rise up against them upon the shortest notice, and snap asunder the restraints of every other social and more artificial tie. The old Romans could employ Masinissa against Syphax, and Bocchus against Jugurtha ; and religion did not interpose ; against the French, on the other hand, the Mahometans of Tunis and of Morocco might any day make common cause with their co-religionists of Oran, Algiers, and Constantine. Nor is it any small enhancement of the danger, that Islamism and Christianity have been confronted with each other from the first ; and that, in fact, the former commenced in a recoil from the latter. The Koran still opens heaven to the champions of the faith ; Arab and Turk still plume themselves upon the feats of their ancestors, and even now, in some native café you may see a score of white burnouses in breathless attention to the reading of the triumphs of Omar, or the expulsion of Christian dogs from Jerusalem by their great hero Saladin.

Again, each of these five races, as we have before said, have a distinct nationality and require separate treatment. Now the French inaugurated their conquest by a most unfortunate mistake. The Turks of Algeria have the character of being 'proud, frugal, gallant, very honest in commercial dealings, very faithful and reliable as allies, even when they have to fight against Mussulmans. They are less fanatical than all their co-religionists, the Mozabites excepted ; they keep their word strictly, and are often generous.\*' Their rapacity, cruelty, and indolence,

---

\* Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 185.

on the other hand, are undeniable. In the heat of the first campaign their expulsion from Algiers was decreed by Marshal Bourmont, and the few that remain only serve to make their loss the more to be regretted. 'The five to six thousand Turks, expelled by Bourmont from Algiers, formed the nucleus of the Dey's army, they alone had kept the country in subjection. Conversant with the character of the Arabs and Kabyles, with the position and mutual relations of the tribes and chiefs, their services would have been most advantageous to the French. By their support and instrumentality the new dominion would have been extended immediately all over the country, and might have replaced the Turkish sway before the tribes became conscious of their power, and before they grew familiar with the idea of an Arab empire. But instead of this the country was thrown into disorganization; the former officials were expelled, and the deeds and rolls of the administration thrown away in the confusion which followed the capture of the Kasbah. The provinces and tribes of the interior were left to shift for themselves, and even the country in the immediate vicinity of the capital was only partially cared for. The natural consequence was, first anarchy, and then an union of the tribes under the supremacy of the mightiest and most fortunate chief.'\*

What happened to the Turks by force, has happened to the Moors from circumstances more or less within their own choice. Large numbers of them have emigrated to Tunis and Morocco; and some have incorporated themselves amongst the Arabs, perhaps, after all, only returning to their pristine stock. Still, as Moors, they have never proved any great impediment to the French; their present nature being mild and pacific, with a certain amount of education and refinement. In fact they like the French far better than the Arabs, except so far as religion is concerned. At the same time they remember their expulsion from Spain by the Rummi, a term by which they designate Europeans, and they have shown, by their voluntary abandonment of house and home, that they have deep-seated feelings in spite of their apathy. They have more sympathy for civilization, it is true, than the wild Bedouin, but their numbers are continually decreasing; they have

---

\* Ibid, p. 234.

little taste for the camp, nor indeed would their most friendly dispositions be likely to stand the ordeal of a war in which the interests of religion were involved.

In the Arabs the French have every obstacle to overcome that the annals of mankind could supply. They are a wild race, whose character, stamped in prophecy near four thousand years ago, remains unchanged, except so far as it has undergone a change for the worse, to the present day. 'His hand is against every man, and every man's hand is against him' still; but his ancestors had never been subdued, and his country gave birth to a race of conquerors. From his own shores the Prophet of God issued forth to give true religion to the world; his forefathers wrested Numidia from the infidel, and for one thousand years preserved both their conquests and their independence inviolate. The Turk came originally by invitation, and not by conquest; they respected the viceroy of their Prophet upon earth, and therefore had not refused tribute to the Sultan. But their independence, the administration of their laws and customs, they had never surrendered or allowed to be taken from them in the whole course of their history. Faithful to his traditions, the Arab of Algeria still cleaves to the patriarchal life, abhorring the contamination of large towns, preferring tents to dwellings of a more durable kind, and a roving to a settled existence. Agriculture is the only tie that binds him to the soil; but flocks and herds are more compatible with his native bias. His philanthropy is confined to his own race; he despises every religion but his own; he looks down upon the benefits of civilization, except so far as they can be incorporated into his actual mode of life, or be turned to account in the chase, or in the camp. He is content with his own slovenly mode of tilling the ground. He ranks science with the occult arts. He has no ambition to be more educated than he is. It is enough for him that his marabouts should acquire knowledge for the good of the public. He is naturally indolent, and therefore prefers taking from others when he can, and when he cannot, doing without superfluities, to the securing them by the sweat of his brow. He has no patriotism, because he has no fixed home; no incentive to peace, because he has so little to lose; indifferent to what may happen, because, like all Mahometans, he is a fatalist. In his temperate habits, in his intercourse

with his brethren he may exercise those virtues which travellers are fond of attributing to the Bedouin of the desert; but in his dealings with Europeans, the Arab of Algeria is cunning, thievish, and lying; his frugality seems the effect of indolence rather than of choice; his treachery but ill accords with our prepossessions of his chivalry; his superstitions are more deeply rooted in him than his religion; and his love of independence assumes the effect of impatience of the restraints which govern society. For the first time in his history he has been thoroughly subdued; but will the French likewise succeed in civilizing him, and making him fraternize with aliens from his faith and blood? If not, let them beware how they let him into the secrets of modern warfare, or they may wing the shaft that will one day be sped against themselves. It is not impossible that the Spahis may yet rival our Sepoys.

Of the two races which remain, the Mozabites, and in them we shall include the inhabitants of the desert generally, are a federative republic, inhabiting three oases of the Sahara, and have a much higher character assigned to them. Some trace them to those Gætulians to whom Rome gave citizenship; others are full of their Moabitish origin. Unlike the Arabs, they inhabit fortified cities, and are as industrious as mechanics, as they are as cultivators of the soil. The Arabs themselves eulogize their superior justice and honesty; and their Talebs, or Doctors, preach the pure Koran without fanaticism. They have, in consequence, been described as Mahometan Protestants.\* One feature in their republican life is very remarkable. 'There are so few ambitious men among them, longing for office, that it often happens that the elected official flies suddenly away from his city, not to be compelled to accept office; but commonly he is pursued, and constrained to accept the dignity bestowed on him.'† Here perhaps their conquerors might copy from them with advantage. Some hundreds of them are domiciled in Algiers, where they exercise their specialities, and maintain intercourse with their countrymen; and it is of these apparently that M. Berard says, 'That they are the

---

\* Blakesley's *Algeria*, p. 280.

† Tricolor on the *Atlas*, p. 202.



only people that have had the good faith to manifest their admiration for our civilization, and exalt its salutary effects.....<sup>\*†</sup>

We are more disposed to agree with the *Annales Algériennes*, and with General Daumas, in our estimate of the Kabyles or Berbers, than with Dr. Wagner. In his time the habits of this singular people had not been thoroughly explored, and they were attacking and being attacked. It is only very recently that they have been completely brought under French rule.† Their origin is probably a very mixed one. 'They inhabit the whole of the coast-mountains from Morocco to Tripoli, and the languages which they speak vary.' We incline therefore to the opinion which regards them as 'a mixture of the different nations which have settled successively in northern Africa, and repressed by new and warlike invaders, have found in the mountains a home of freedom. The blood of Numidians, Phœnicians, and Vandals, mingled when those people sought successively a refuge in the Atlas, and engendered a new nation.'‡ We have already spoken of the ancient city of Lambesa, as having been disinterred by the French. It is encircled by a branch of the Atlas, called the Auras, and the whole neighbourhood abounds with ruins, and is intersected frequently by the old Roman road. Here, therefore, the empire of the West was powerfully represented; while we gather from monumental inscriptions that most of the legions employed in those parts were recruited from Germany. When Numidia fell into the hands of the Vandals, it is likewise probable that they directed their attacks against the most thriving settlements, and located themselves most extensively in the most fertile spots. Such would be the table-land between Constantine and Lambesa. Now it is precisely in these regions of the mountain range, that the Kabyle is fair-haired, and of light complexion, and what is still more remarkable, exhibits a small cross tattooed on his forehead—a badge still common to some Oriental Christians: and in use, likewise, amongst the women of some of the Kabyle tribes

---

\* *Indicateur general de l'Algerie.* Alger, 1858.

† For the last war the Sketches of Col. Walmsley, himself an eye-witness, are most interesting.

‡ *Tricolor on the Atlas*, p. 161.



in other parts. Further, throughout Kabylia, the female sex enjoys a liberty, and is treated with a respect that contrast strangely with their condition in a Turkish or Arab ménage. Kabyle legislation again is in accordance with their mixed origin. They have, besides the Koran, a code which ancient tradition has handed down to them, and in which certain offences have certain pecuniary fines attached to them; but murder does not figure in the category. Authority will not interpose between the avenger of blood and the manslayer, and bloodshed is irredeemable. They have likewise statutes, which they call *Kanoûns*; another vestige of their Christianity, says General Daumas,\* for it is only the word 'canons' Kabyalized. But it will not do to linger over these interesting characteristics. The remark of the French soldiers in fighting with the Kabyles was, that they did not, like the Arabs, fight and run away, but where they stood, there they fell. They had a country to die for, like the Swiss or Tyrolese. Thoroughly republican in their organization, they are even more jealous of their individual independence. It is not enough for them that their tribe should be upon absolute equality with all other tribes, if they themselves are not likewise upon absolute equality with their brethren. *Enta cheikh, una cheikh,* or, 'you chief, I chief,' was the retort of a peasant to the 'amim,' or magistrate of his village. In marvellous illustration of their proud spirit of independence, they bring their 'yakka' and 'achour,' or taxes prescribed by the Koran, not to their authorities, but to the mosques, as to God alone: with no less high-souled regard for the dignity of the individual, they look on the bastinado, which the degenerate Arab still prefers to a fine, as the last of degradations that can be inflicted upon man. As regards their general character, none have disputed their industry, or even a certain amount of proficiency in the arts. Their gunpowder is so well manufactured as to be mistaken for English; their counterfeit money—though this trade is not in repute—has been maintained to be genuine, by a banker of Algiers, already apprized of its spuriousness.† They are good miners, and good tanners; they make excellent pottery, and can forge both the sword and the

---

\* *La Kabylie par le General E. Daumas*, p. 52; also p. 20.

† *La Kabylie*, p. 48.

sickle. They weave superior carpets and burnouses. One who seems to have visited their country says that he could never understand the story of the Forty Thieves quite, till he had seen the jars in which their oil is stowed away, of a size well capable of containing full grown men, armed and fully equipped.\* Arab hospitality has been much extolled, and we maintain, exaggerated, at least in Algeria, and that of the Kabyle depreciated, because unknown. But to be safe in a single tribe amongst Arabs, you must have your 'aman,' or passport, from some one in authority; neither does his protection avail beyond his tribe. The 'anaye,' or Kabyle passport, on the other hand, can be obtained by the stranger from the first and meanest Kabyle with whom he has made friends, and it is respected in the village of him who gives it: but let the token, which it always is, have been given by one of their Marabouts, and it is omnipotent throughout Kabylia, and even shields the offender from vengeance. The last of their institutions which we shall notice is one in which General Daumas thinks he sees further evidence of their former Christianity, namely, their 'zaouia,' or religious university.† It is here that indiscriminate hospitality is exercised, and both the stranger and the poor are cared for; that children have religion and secular acquirements instilled into them; and literary men (tolbas) perfect their studies. A mosque built over the tomb of some Marabout is indispensable to the establishment; and hither the faithful repair from all parts,—as to the shrine of S. Francis, at Assisi, or of S. Dominic, at Bologna,—to make, and supplicate for the performance of their vows. It is supported by voluntary contributions, as well as a share of the taxes. The Marabouts themselves are its directors. Their lives, it has been remarked, would compare with our accounts of the ascetics of the Thebaid. Considered as a public establishment, the 'zaouia' is at once a religious university, and a gratuitous 'auberge,' says the same author, 'in striking analogy with the mediæval monastery. Considered as a political institution, it is the centre from which every influence shoots forth, and from

---

\* Algiers in 1857, by Rev. E. W. L. Davies, p. 110.

† p. 26.

which the word of order throughout Kabylia is derived.\* But how are the French to establish relations with these mountaineers, who live so completely to themselves in their inaccessible fastnesses? They have a curious custom of facilitating intercourse with the rest of the world, and no less striking in its originality. One of every Kabyle family is obliged for a time to seek his fortune in one of the principal towns of the country, till he can return home with a competency. Hence their numbers in Oran, Algiers, Setif, Constantine, and Bona.

The whole Kabyle population is estimated at 850,000: that of the scattered sons of the desert may be a trifle more: while the Arabs are said to be as numerous as the populations of Kabylia and Sahara united: Moors not above 100,000: Turks, with their descendants, the Kuruglis, only 6,000: Jews, 19,000: Negroes, lastly from the interior, all virtually slaves, but always commended for their integrity, 3,000.† From the foregoing sketch it would appear that Turks and Moors will soon cease to exist in Algeria; that it is with the races of the Sahara and of Kabylia that the French may be expected to make most progress, and that it is in the Arab population that their main difficulty will ever consist. Could they succeed in making the Mozabite and the Kabyle their friends, could they find means of encouraging immigration from the interior to any great extent by the Negroes; could they contrive that the European population should increase in Algeria with the same rapid strides that it does in the United States, Canada, or Australia, they might then be content to keep down the Arab by force, or banish him gradually back to his native wilderness, with his flocks and herds, and abandon his regeneration as hopeless. We think that they have already concentrated far too much of their labours upon his irreclaimable nature, to the exclusion of some that are much more natives of the soil, less hostile in their antecedents, and more hopeful in their present attitude. But how shall we characterize those difficulties which the French have created for themselves all the world over—and not merely in their north-African colonies—by their insatiate love of revolutions, and their

---

\* p. 22.† *Indicateur General de l'Algerie*, p. 35.

political inconsistencies, vague and variable as the wind? During the short time that they have held Algeria they have dethroned their hereditary king, and exiled their constitutional king; they have abolished monarchy and proclaimed a republic; they have quarreled with their republic, and substituted for it, in a time of peace, a despotism unparalleled in their history by universal suffrage! Those champions of liberty that made Europe, that made the universe resound with their advocacy, with the clang of their arms in its behalf, have cast it from them as a polluted thing, and of their own accord have accepted a yoke that gags them, and fetters them, and treats them as maniacs that require restraint, and extorts money from them to array their keepers in purple and fine linen, the better to overawe them. Is this the lesson that is to be imparted to the wild Arab, to the republican Kabyle and Mozabite, a people that prize freedom even more than those boundless mountains and deserts in which they live, and whose independence even the autocrats of Constantinople respected? What will be the value which these nations will set upon the blessings of civilization, when they see so much fickleness, and reckless action, and mockery of the sacred ordinance of liberty, in a people at the head of civilization? The crafty Arab detects at a glance the true state of the case; he venerates realities that are too high for him; he sees through and abhors a sham. He loathes despotism in every shape, whether it be the savage form upheld by the Turk, or the meretricious Parisian ideal saturated with pomade! No people can succeed in re-organizing another country upon stable foundations that are continually changing themselves. If the results of the Crimean war were, happily, to make the French feel how seriously foreign wars interfere with the progress of colonization, they may assuredly gather from events that require no further discussion, how much more seriously its permanence is liable to be endangered by domestic instability.

Do we assert, therefore, that the French have done nothing, or that they have failed in all that they have done, in Algeria? On the contrary, we say that they have done marvels, far beyond what any other nation in their circumstances would have attempted. Their difficulties have been immense, but they have looked them full in the face, and then grappled with them as became

men. They have lavished lives, they have lavished money, they have lavished labour untold, upon the civilization and well-being of their new possessions. All that colonists usually have to do for themselves has been done to their hand by the government. The country has been thrown open to them, in some of the most important respects, ready made. Indeed, with the exception of ports and railways, there scarce remains anything more for the government to do, unless it be to retain and develop what has already been done. Further interference on their part would be more of a hindrance than a boon. All that is really wanting is to remove every restriction upon independent action, and let individuals have every possible liberty, with the least possible intrusive surveillance, to mature their own schemes, and set themselves to work in the way which they judge to be most advantageous and most in accordance with their means and capacities. It will be quite enough for the government to see that the principles which it has laid down shall be impartially carried out, and that its own officials and underlings shall not mar the good work by any conduct unbecoming their station, or any intermeddling with individuals beyond what the laws absolutely necessitate. There is abundant cause for redoubled vigilance in these respects, as we shall see.

As regards religion we have already stated the general principle laid down by the government, to be that of non-interference, and strictly guaranteed, and impartially enforced, toleration. Nevertheless, in many respects even this principle has been overstrained. The French are a highly cultivated people, far beyond what the old Romans were, and they have never determined, and perhaps never will determine, the exact amount of their obligations to the religion which they profess for their present enlightenment. Their very profession of it, however, is a tacit recognition of its excellence, and before they go so far as to encourage, and not merely tolerate, any other religion in their dominions, they should be prepared to say whether they would exchange the civilization attendant upon any such religion for their own. How can it be consistent to despise the barbarism and ignorance of the Turks and Arabs, and in the same breath magnify the excellence of their religion? a religion which has so largely entered into their daily life for so many centuries, without either advancing their intelligence or counteracting their savage

nature. Toleration is surely possible without encouragement; and it is surely possible to do justice to the merits of the Koran without glossing over its errors, or dissembling its palpable inferiority to a religion whose more perfect results are self-evident. According to the views of the French writers of our own days, Mahometanism has been grossly misrepresented, and till of late but imperfectly known. The poor camel driver of Mecca is at length beginning to have justice done to his memory. Friends and foes have come to the conclusion that he deserves to be called a civilizer; that his code was a great advance on the polytheism and idolatry which it supplanted; that it introduced many social improvements; that there is a grandeur about it in its purely religious aspect that is incontestable, and finally, that after the lapse of thirteen centuries it is not possible to find one of its votaries lukewarm in his allegiance.\* As if the Koran had not claimed to supplant, and had supplanted, Christianity as well as heathenism; as if, in some of its enactments, it did not pander to the strongest passions that are in man; and as if it was not now, as from the first, identified with the most bloodthirsty precepts ever promulgated under the guise of religion. "The sword," says Mahomet, "is the key to heaven and hell; one drop of blood spilt for the cause of Allah, one night passed watching under arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting and prayer. Whosoever dies in battle his sins are forgiven."† Is it candid, is it wise, to dissemble these facts? Former writers may have dwelt upon them too exclusively, but it will never do to try to write up Islamism by omitting them. Such, however, has been the fashion with French writers for some time past; and what is still worse, it has been endorsed by a succession of overt acts on the part of the government. "Assuredly,"‡ says Count de Montalembert, in his famous article upon British India, "we shall not meet with any state paper, penned by an English functionary, professing an equal amount of sympathy and

---

\* *Ouvrage inédit de M. le General Daumas, quoted in the Almanach de l'Algerie for 1857, pp. 149-164.*

† *Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 128.*

‡ See the *Times* for Friday, Nov. 12, 1858, where this passage occurs in the translation.



protection for Mahomedan worship, as the speech of M. Latour-Mézerey, Prefect of Algiers, in 1857, to the Muftis and Ulemas, in which he quoted the Koran with unction, in order to exalt the munificence of the emperor towards Islam. I do not remember having seen a single word of criticism on this speech in those French newspapers which are the most prodigal in invective against the pretended complicity of the Anglo-Indians with the worship of Juggernaut.".....We might ask in the same spirit whether the idea of a mosque in Paris for Mahometans could have been borrowed from any similar edifice erected by our government in the city of London for Brahmins or for Buddhists? To build and repair mosques in Algeria, to pay native Muftis and Ulemas out of the public funds, to have Mahometan children instructed in the Koran, and to interdict their teacher from unsettling them in their faith—all this belongs to a government whose principle is universal toleration. Nor shall we dispute but that Islamism merits a higher level than those forms of heathenism above mentioned. But is it therefore to be unduly exalted? and ought governments professing Christianity to shrink from avowing their deliberate conviction of the greater perfections and more civilizing influences of the religion which they profess, even while they force nobody to come over to it against his conscience? Indifference to their religion, it has been truly remarked, is rare even in this, the thirteenth century of their existence, amongst Mahometans. The writer might have added,\* that nothing perplexes them more than to see Christians indifferent to theirs. It is a point upon which all travellers are unanimous. "Sometimes," says Dr. Wagner, speaking of some Arab chiefs with whom he had made acquaintance, "sometimes they entered into a disputation about Christianity and Islamism, and they seemed to like my defending my faith with warmth, since with the Arabs the religious indifference of the French is an inexplicable riddle, and is productive of much astonishment and disgust."† The antithesis between French practice and the Koran is singular enough. Mahomet considered that religion was too sublime for the nature of women; from

---

\* General Daumas, see above.

† Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 173.



French practice one would be led to conclude that the nature of man was too sublime for religion. In Mahometan countries women are barely admitted to the mosques on sufferance; in French Algeria the churches seem exclusively for the women, and few men that are not priests or ecclesiastics of some kind ever frequent them. Those, indeed, who absent themselves the most habitually, and who seem to plume themselves the most in so doing, are the civil and military authorities, high and low, perhaps the last still more than the first. They seem to take special pains to make known to the Arab population in what contempt they hold their religion, and how far beneath their dignity it would be to practise it. They take care that they shall never be suspected of saying a prayer even in private. Unfortunately this contempt which they exhibit for religion either recoils upon themselves—for the Arab is persuaded that there is a God above—or else, if he can believe them sincere, when he hears them eulogise his faith, commend his superior morality, speak of his Prophet as a great man, he is possessed with the idea that Frenchmen are dissatisfied with their religion, and will, before long, embrace Mahometanism. There are really few Arabs in Algeria that are not under the latter impression more or less; and truly when they see civilization accompanied by so much immorality and intemperance, by so much infidelity and scorn of religion, as is displayed by their conquerors, it is impossible that they should not believe one of two things—either that civilization and religious indifference go hand in hand, in which case every Arab would pray devoutly to be quit of the bargain—or else that the French people, to be as moral and religious as they are civilized, must exchange the Gospel of Christ for the Koran.

For the advancement of education and literature we do not exaggerate when we say that the French deserve unmixed praise. By education we mean that of the natives; and by literature that of the country past and present. By a decree bearing date July 14, 1850, French-Arab schools were established at Oran, Tlemcen, Mostaganem, Algiers, Blida, Constantine, and Bona. Their number has been increased since. They are entirely gratuitous, and are divided into two separate departments, one for boys and one for girls. Both sexes are taught reading and writing in the French and Arabic languages;

the boys learn, in addition, arithmetic, history, geography, drawing, and music; while the girls have lessons in sewing and embroidery. Private seminaries have been opened for the same laudable ends, and some of them with aid from the government. That of Mme. Luce, for instance, in the heart of Algiers, is assisted by a grant of 3,000 francs annually from the treasury, and numbers no less than 150 young Moorish ladies of the upper classes. Another has been opened by Mme. Chevalier. A third for Jewesses by M. Cohan-Solah. Native children likewise frequent the schools of the different religious orders; but here, as elsewhere, the bounds of secular instruction are not allowed to be infringed. Lastly, the government has founded a superior school for the education of Ulemas, or jurisconsults, exclusively, as well as a college for Arabs. The superiority of these institutions over the old native schools—many of which exist still, and are worth visiting for their originality—is beginning to be felt and appreciated. But they have yet to win their way amongst the masses. Most of the boys who attend them belong to the higher classes, and we should say of the Moors rather than the Arabs, officials of the latter race excepted; still, even so, the experiment has been made upon the most influential part of the community, and the difference between a Kaid that can neither read nor write in his own tongue, and his sons who can read and write, both in French and Arabic, will come out strongly in the next generation. Add to which that the Arab youths will have contracted friendships with the sons of their conquerors—for French boys attend the same schools—and have acquired a taste for their habits, which they will retain through life. And so there is every hope of a reciprocal improvement of feeling on both sides. Female education is attended with more difficulty, on account of the great unwillingness of the Mahometans to trust their daughters from home; and it is a remarkable fact, that while the boys attending the French-Arab schools come from the higher ranks, the girls are usually a base-born offspring. Perhaps, too, there is a reluctance on the part of the Arab to see women elevated in the social scale. Mme. Luce, however, seems to have broken the ice with some of the upper classes, and we may hope that their example will be contagious. Meanwhile no such difficulty will be experienced amongst the Kabyle population; nor

would the inhabitants of Kabylia be more likely to undervalue the benefits of education than the Moor or Bedouin. We trust, therefore, that the French will neither confine their education to the higher ranks among the latter, nor yet to the latter people. The very Negro may well be admitted to his share in the common boon. The separation of secular from religious instruction has been looked upon in this country with jealousy, but it has been universally recognized in the East. Most of the Christian schools at Jerusalem and Damascus, in Asia Minor, and throughout Greece, are of a mixed nature. Greeks and Armenians send their children to the schools of the Latin Convents for instruction in secular knowledge, while religion is taught them exclusively by their own priests. Nobody, whether in Algeria or Syria, objects to the character of the education thus given and received. On the contrary, the principle acts beneficially upon the schools themselves, in the way of incentive to activity and constant amelioration of their respective systems. Throughout the East the Catholic or Latin convents are reputed to have the best schools, but it is competition that has made them so; and it is their exclusively secular character that has enabled them to compete with their neighbours. Many of these schools are numerous attended, and yet cannot boast of a single Catholic boy or girl amongst their pupils; consequently did religion form part of their instruction, they would simply cease to exist, for Greeks, Kopts, and Armenians would never allow their children to be taught what they deem heterodoxy. But then it is to be observed that these eastern schools are not state schools in any sense, and that if religion is not overtly taught, still nothing like irreligion is even indirectly countenanced. It is known that their teachers are either ministers of, or thorough believers in, a definite creed, though not necessarily that of their pupils; and this circumstance assists greatly to counterbalance the otherwise secular tone of the school in the minds of the young, to make them reverence their teacher as being a religious man, and his religion as being that of their teacher. Even in Algeria the pure state-schoolmaster is a "*rara avis*," the Christian Brothers and the Sisters of Charity conducting the majority of the government schools there, as in France, and having even more respect paid them by the Arabs than in their mother country. When the Sisters of Charity first arrived there,

we are told that the natives flocked to gaze upon them from all quarters. They had long heard of their devotedness to the sick and poor, and they welcomed them as angels descended from heaven !

But how have the French been able to found schools for the instruction of the natives in their own vernacular ? The truth is that the French have become great Arabic scholars themselves. Nothing can be more praiseworthy than the zeal with which they have applied themselves to the study of the language and literature—such as it is indeed ! of a people whom they have conquered. Assuredly Cambrians cannot say the same of the English ! In each of the metropolitan towns of Oran, Algiers, and Constantine, there is a Professor of Arabic, and gratuitous lectures are given for the benefit of the more advanced students. By a decree of December 4, 1849, again, a prize is annually offered to all employés in the civil service for the best examination in that language. Officers in the army were allured to it by appointments in the Bureau Arabe, where proficiency was indispensable. Nor have these overtures on the part of government been ill-responded to, or unprolific. French-Arabic grammars, dictionaries, familiar dialogues, easy lessons, vocabularies, have made Arabic as acceptable to the beginner as Latin or Greek, French or English. In short few languages have ever been made more easy. The Arab boy probably learns his own tongue from his French preceptor far more grammatically and correctly than he could do under native instruction. Nor have the French confined themselves to the practical study of the mere language ; they have ransacked Arabic literature, and are daily giving the results of their researches to the world. Baron de Slane, for instance, has translated a history of the Berbers, by Ibn-Khaldoun ; M. Noel des Verges a history of Africa and of Sicily under Mahometan rule, by the same author. M. Defrénery, the Travels of Ibn Batoutah ; and M. Cherbouneau, the learned Professor of Arabic in the city of Constantine, a history of the Conquest of Spain by the Moors, from the chronicle of Ibn-el-Kouthya. M. Cherbouneau stands foremost among those who have dug up and brought to light hidden treasure. His paper upon Arab literature in the Soudan is the first notice that we have seen of any intellectual movement, past or present,

among the blacks.\* One of our countrymen, Mr. Davies, has made the ruins of Carthage his permanent abode, and is constantly sending home Punic inscriptions to be decyphered by the learned. Among the ancient inscriptions in the *Archæological Journal* of the province of Constantine, we find not only Punic, but specimens of the Phœnician, Libyan, Numidian, and Berber characters. When their nature has been sufficiently explored, it is possible that some interesting facts may be brought out respecting that much calumniated people, the Carthaginians. Another spirited archæologist is M. Renier. Under his auspices upwards of 6,000 Roman inscriptions have been copied and published by the French government; while engravings of the monuments themselves may be seen in the magnificent work entitled "*Exploration Scientifique de l'Algerie pendant les années, 1840-2,*" a noble addition to the records of primitive Christianity and classical art. Since these publications many more interesting remains have been disinterred; and though the museums of Algiers and of Cherchell will probably never rival the Museo Borbonico, still they would afford very valuable information, should any one feel inclined to re-write the history of Numidia and Africa Propria, from the fragmentary notices and evidences that have been exhumed. One circumstance alone would facilitate the labours of any future historian, namely, that the sites of so many towns, long since forgotten, have been recovered. Madaurus, the country of Apuleius, Thagaste, the birth-place of St. Augustine, Milevum, the see of St. Optatus, Icosium, Calama, Russicada, Setifis Colonia, are no longer names without localities. It is possible that the gigantic Kober-Roumia,† a monument only surpassed by

---

\* Pp. 1-48 of the *Journal* of the A. S. of the province of Constantine.

† See *Indicateur General de l'Algerie*, p. 88, the most accurate and most recent account, for Mr. Blakesley's is greatly below par. Its outer architecture doubtless belongs to a later period, probably of the same date as the ruined village of Tipasa, from whose quarries the stone was evidently hewn. By the Arabs it is called "Tomb of the Christian Lady." Some say of Cava, daughter of Count Julian, the ally of the Moors. (See the *Tricolor* on the Atlas, p. 67.) Or the tomb of Cecilia Metella may have suggested it. At all

the pyramids of Egypt, may have been the mausoleum mentioned by Pomponius Mela, between Iol (Cherchell) and Icosium, (Algiers), of the ancient kings of Mauritania; and that its pendant near Batna, the Madr'asen, may contain the ashes of Syphax, of the kings of Numidia, or, as M. Cherbonneau suggests,\* of king Aradion. At all events ancient architecture has left few specimens that are more imposing. Some of these localities, Calama for instance,† may have suffered from the exigencies of the French soldiery; but it is equally certain that most of these antiquarian discoveries have been made, and the inscriptions copied, in the first instance, by French officers. Archæologists again would have been more pleased, and we think commercial and even sanitary ends generally better answered, had the French avoided building upon old sites, and thought more of railways, harbours, roads, commerce, health, when they laid out their new towns. Military occupation evidently has been the thing uppermost in their minds, and it is only wonderful that with these views they should have done so much to benefit literature, and so little of which her most ardent enthusiasts can, with justice, complain.

Equally true is it that in the administration of justice in Algeria, so far as the inhabitants are concerned, the French have exercised great wisdom and moderation. All offences against French law are carried into French courts, but the Arabs have native courts in which offences against their own law are tried; and judgment is pronounced by the Kadi, or magistrate, who receives a salary from government. From his sentence a court of appeal has been established, called Medjeles. In short, the native code has been left intact for all purposes of litigation

---

events the Roman cement, and vestiges of a Roman inscription by the door on the north, incontestably prove the hand of the Romans in it.

\* But the *engaged* columns, Tuscan capitals, and laying of the stones, (all lengthways) bespeak a more remote antiquity. Besides there are traces of characters that look like Numidian on the north and south sides. See the journal (*Annuaire*) before quoted, p. 180; comp. pp. 108-119.

† Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 91. Mr. Blakesley, p. 230, is far too sweeping in his censures.



between natives themselves, where it does not contravene French law. Even the use of the bastinado has been tolerated in compliance with the wishes of a people who are insensible to the disgrace of corporal punishments, but are loth to be fined or imprisoned.

In the same way government continues to be administered to them through the accustomed channels, though in the Sheikh, Kaid, and Agha, the French profess to see the exact counterpart of their mayor, sub-prefect, and prefect. These native chiefs exercise lordship over their respective tribes, and collect taxes, and execute ordinances, for the French government. Hitherto the government of Algeria has been centred in the Governor-General, assisted by a council. His authority extended over the three provinces of Oran, Algiers, and Constantine, and his decrees, when confirmed by the Minister of War in the mother country, passed into laws. Each of the three provinces contained within it a department presided over by civil, and a division presided over by military authorities. In reality, however, it was the military element, or generals of division, that exerted the greatest sway with the fewest checks, and it was the incessant petition of the colonist to have his village placed under civil jurisdiction. It was to the military authorities likewise that the native chiefs before mentioned were for by far the most part subject. The government addressed the Agha through the generals of division and their subalterns; and the Agha, with the assistance of his Kaid and Sheiks, collected the revenue and enforced order in his district. Latterly, indeed, a special board, called the Bureau Arabe, was instituted to be the medium of communication; but then it was still under the direction of French officers, though administered through native agency. Travellers have with one accord testified their grateful acknowledgments to the Bureau Arabe, and with good reason. Its interpreters were always ready to oblige, and to give reliable information; and its letters were more valuable than a Foreign Office passport by far, as they ensured hospitality as well as respect and security. Like every institution it had its abuses notwithstanding—it had become the hot-bed of corrupt practices, and the Tlemcen tragedy caused rigid enquiries to be made, which have resulted in the suppression of what promised to be, and in fact was in many respects, a most valuable establishment.



Doubtless the same thing will be restored under another form. But the truth is, the whole administration of the country is being so thoroughly remodelled, that to dwell more upon the government, even as it existed but a year since, would be to speak of a thing of the past, and to criticize what has been abandoned. If the following words of M. G ry, the new Prefect of Algiers, are not exaggerations, some of our criticisms will have been already forestalled.

“People of Algiers. Algeria has ceased to be a colony. Under the generous impulse of His Imperial Highness Prince Napoleon, a new organization has assimilated the departments of Algeria to those of the mother country; has imparted, by conferring on them independence, greater energy to the local authorities, has preserved as a safeguard an army commanded by one of the most illustrious generals of the empire; has left full liberty to individual initiative, and opened the way to many important improvements.”\*...The French are fond of “assimilation.” When we dine with a Frenchman “en famille,” we see children who have not entered their teens sitting down to a six o’clock dinner in the midst of a company of grown up people, eating of every variety of rich dish that is handed round, and behaving with a mannerism, and giving lively vent to a conversation that is far beyond their years. Upon the same principle we suppose it is that Algeria—a babe in arms—is to be “assimilated” to the mother country. “Algeria has ceased to be a colony.” It is startling to be told that it has ceased to be what in fact it had scarce ever been. Had the announcement been that it had begun to be a colony, it would have been more consistent, and we must add, more pregnant with hope. We are now about to enter upon this branch of the subject, namely, the attitude of the government towards colonization and colonists, and it will be by no means the bright side of the picture, we fear.

In the first place, the French committed a great error against themselves, when they took possession of the country, through ignorance of the laws of Turkish sove-

---

\* See the Times of Nov. 24, 1858, under the head of Algeria. Prince Napoleon, however, has long since resigned his office. Has this programme therefore become a dead letter?

reignty. The inhabitants were mere occupants of the soil, without any more permanent title than the will and pleasure of their liege lord, the Sultan or his vicegerents. It would have been consistent with justice had the French government resumed the whole territory, and only granted it back permanently to the inhabitants on condition of some yearly acknowledgment, however small, or a fixed price once for all. But the French were full of their European ideas, and only took possession of those lands that were unoccupied and unclaimed, and those which had formed the domains of the Deys. It is still doubtful whether all have been recovered that came under the last category, for when the Turks were expelled the traditions of the old administration went with them. The consequence was, that, in familiar parlance, the French were *done* by the Arabs to a very considerable extent. Again, it was for a long time undecided what the French would do with their new possessions. From 1830 to 1840 it was a mere military occupation, and nothing more. Eight different generals succeeded each other in the command of the army and of the country, campaign followed upon campaign, and was there a short respite for internal organization, a fresh Governor-General stepped in to reverse the system of his predecessor. With Marshal Bugeaud things began to assume a more settled aspect. He held office from the commencement of 1841 to the summer of 1847, and his name will be long remembered in Algeria both for his military achievements and for the energy which he devoted to systematic improvements. Still the summit of his aspirations seems to have been bounded by the circumstances of the moment. He saw difficulties on all sides, and thought that the only plan which promised success was one which had been originated in old time by a general of his own stamp and fortunes, and had been found to answer, in other words, a military colony, such as Sylla founded for the reward of his veterans, and which the Cæsars continued. Meanwhile the power of Abd-el-Kader had to be crushed, and Marshal Bugeaud had been supplanted by the Duc d'Aumale before the country was assured to the French by the capture of the only man capable of organizing any resistance to their dominion. Whatever good Marshal Bugeaud achieved was nipped in the bud by the troubles which ensued in France. Once more the office of Governor-General was bandied about

from hand to hand, and the Arabs took advantage of the general confusion to multiply revolts. Marshal Randon has been a second Bugeaud since 1851. Colonization has advanced under his auspices more than it had ever done before, but war with Russia, wars with the Arab and with the Kabyle, have interfered greatly with the progress of his administration. Then the pacification of Kabylia has been followed by his recall. Still it is only from 1850 that Algeria began to be in any just sense of the word a colony. In a colonial point of view, therefore, let the question be asked, What have been the deeds of the government up to, and more particularly since, that time?

First and foremost in our enquiry we are bound to notice those gigantic works of peace, accomplished, in the intervals of their campaigns, by the victorious army, and which have crowned them with laurels more exuberant, and glory far more appreciable, than any that could have been won from the wild Bedouin. The French army is radically of a different make from the English. It is the fruit of conscription, and contains within it a complete town. All trades and crafts are found in it, from the simple peasant to the tailor and shoemaker, and from the raw mason and carpenter to the more scientific mechanic. Hence it can, and does, bend itself to the arts of peace with a pliancy that is only surpassed by its 'elan' against the foe. And it is to the credit of the soldiers, no less than of their commanders, that this their admirable versatility has not been allowed to lie dormant. 'Altogether,' says Dr. Wagner, 'the employment of soldiers in the construction of works of public utility, is one of the most laudable results of the occupation of Algeria.....' A splendid example is given in the same page of the same author. 'Mers-el-Kebir is the harbour of Oran, but, unfortunately, two French leagues distant from that city..... The French set actively to work, and blasted a road through the cliffs, in order to secure an access from the town to the harbour. In several places the tertiary lime cliff, rising to 80 feet, was to be demolished; in another place a tunnel had to be bored through the rocks; and such was the hardness of the material that it cost one year of incessant labour to perforate the cliff for 200 feet. This road, and all the others in the Regency, were like the drainage of the plain

of Metija, and of that of Bona, made by the army.\* We well know what the salutary effects have been of the draining of those boundless plains; and what countless difficulties will require to be surmounted for the completion of the operation. But the road from Blidah to Medeah—the passage of the gorges of the Chiffa—is a triumph over nature that would compare with the Simplon or the Splügen. For miles it is carried, like the foregoing one, through the solid limestone that defied every other agency but that of gunpowder, and then yielded most unwillingly till the required space had been obtained. Hence it is, that except at the angles—which, however, are of very frequent recurrence—it is a complete zig-zag the whole way. It is seldom broad enough for two vehicles to pass, while so pointed and so abrupt are the angles themselves, that in rounding them the long and unwieldy diligence seems often to be steering directly over the precipice beneath. But if the excessive hardness of the rock presented a general difficulty on the one hand, the exceptional difficulty, arising from the friable nature of the soil in certain places, was even greater on the other. At intervals the stratum of limestone would come suddenly to an end, and then, between it and the next, intervened a considerable bed, in extent and depth, of loose crumbling earth that nothing would bind. Had it been possible to have supported it by means of parapets, we may be sure that a means so obvious would have been resorted to by the French engineers; as it is, the ordinary expedient is, to cut deeper and deeper into the mountain side for a new level, as the side abutting the precipice begins to crack and crumble away. It is only when the road descends to the level of the river that masonry has been called into requisition to any great degree; and this, for the purpose of establishing a solid break-water.

Another important service of the French army, and one which has elicited still greater applause from the native population, is the sinking of Artesian wells. This has been done on the very confines of the desert—at Tamarna for instance—with the most perfect success. As the boring proceeds, intense interest is manifested on the part of the Arabs; and when the gushing waters burst forth, their

---

\* Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 102.

excitement becomes frenzy. The ceremony has brought together every man, woman and child, of every tribe, far and near. All give vent to their feelings in a shriek of joy ; men fire off their guns, women scream, children are plunged screaming into the water by their parents, as though for baptism. Then all salute their benefactors with shouts of gratitude, and kiss their garments. Fruits are served, dancing begins, sheep are slaughtered, in honour of the occasion. A simple miner of the name of Gautherot, seems to be supernaturally inspired on the subject of water ; his indications have never been known to fail, and the supply which they have already produced is incredible. Lastly, the French soldier is frequently employed in the erection of his own barracks, in the laying out of new towns, and upon fortifications. The great penitentiary, or house of detention, near the ruins of Lambesa, is the work of the convicts by whom it is inhabited.

An undertaking of the government, more peculiarly its own, has been the formation of public nursery grounds, where plants are experimented upon, and acclimated, and afterwards sold at a reduced price to the colonist. There is one of these 'pépinières' attached to every town of importance ; but the 'Jardin d'Essai' near Algiers is the most celebrated of them all. The greater part of it is open to the public at all times, and a ticket is readily obtained at the 'bureau' to see the rest. Here the trial of the cotton plant does not seem to have been crowned as yet by complete success. Coffee did remarkably well till it was cut off by a recently severe winter. Among trees, that called by the French, 'Bel-Ombre,' is said to have been introduced by a late English Consul, though it is now common in the country, and from its rapid growth, of some size. Palm, date, cocoa, and banana-trees are numerous and luxuriant, with sago, croton, and castor plants. Many species of the ficus, among them the ficus elastica. Various tribes of the hybiscus, some of them changing colour with the sunbeams,—the rich hues of the scarlet euphorbia,—vast quantities of the bamboo, the sorgo, sugar-cane, papyrus, and a multitude known only to the botanical student. Flowers are not so abundant, but the bright glow and infinite colours of the ordinary convolvulus are a perfect feast for European eyes.

Government has likewise taken measures for promoting the number, and ameliorating the breed, of sheep and

cattle; and native races come off in the autumn, under sanction of the authorities, in the plain below Mustapha, for the purpose of drawing out and improving the qualities of the Arab steed. Agriculture is stimulated by local societies, expositions, and prizes. In 1855 a prize of 20,000f. was given for the best cultivation of cotton; while ten prizes of 5,000f. have been offered for the present year. The whole number of prizes awarded last year by the central and imperial agricultural society for miscellaneous productions, was 27. The following statistics will serve to illustrate the extent to which agriculture has been developed.

In 1855 corn was cultivated upon a superficies of 994,416 hectares, and the value of the crops amounted to 115,872,809f. In 1856 Algeria produced 658 bales of cotton, which were sold at Havre the following year, for the gross sum of 236,185f. By the end of May, 1857, the cultivation of cotton had obtained a development of 1500 hectares. In the year 1856 the silk of Algeria was sold in Lyons at 117f. the kilogramme; and the gross amount which it fetched was 18,356f. Tobacco—all of which is bought up by the government—gave the following details in the month of June, 1857.

	Planters.	Hectares.	Plants.
Algiers .....	2287	4337,55	123,364,500
Constantine.....	441	366,21	10,433,300
Oran.....	507	387,61	12,999,880
	<hr/> 3235	<hr/> 5091,37	<hr/> 146,797,680*

Sorgo was introduced from China in 1853, and it has been found that the yield averages 50,000 kilogramme-weight of plants per hectare. The palm-date of the desert produces in a year of plenty 300lbs weight of fruit; the opium-plant 627 kilogramme-weight of pods per hectare; bunches of grapes will frequently weigh 5 and 6lbs.

It is now time to speak of the regulations affecting commerce and those which regard navigation. There have been three principal epochs, so to speak, in their history, beginning from 1835. In that year the following decrees of the Governor-General passed into law.

---

\* *Indicateur General de l'Algerie*, p. 12.



1. Transports between France and Algeria to be reserved to the French flag, for all purposes of international commerce; foreign flags to be admitted on payment of 2*fr.* per ton.

2. French goods, and likewise foreign goods that have paid duty in French ports, to be admitted free.

3. All kinds of provisions, materials for building, and other necessary articles, no matter from whence brought, to be admitted free.

4. All other foreign merchandize to pay the  $\frac{1}{2}$  or  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the duties imposed in the French tariff; and all that is there prohibited, to be allowed to enter under a duty of 12 or 15 per cent.

Thus, during the first period, great encouragement was given to foreign trade, nor is the word 'prohibition' to be found in the tariff. Further, a supplemental ordinance of February 27, 1837, gave permission to foreign flags to effect transports between France and Algeria, on payment of 2*fr.* per ton; and also to ply between one port and another in the latter country. This, however, was so actively made use of, that it was abridged by a counter ordinance of Dec. 7, 1841, in compliance with the loud complaints of the home traders, never to be revived.

It was soon found that these regulations were too favourable to foreign trade, and operated to the disadvantage of the mother-country, and of the mutual intercourse which should exist between her and the colony. Accordingly, their modification was decreed Dec. 16, 1843, and the following new enactments form what we shall call the 2nd period:—

1. Tonnage on foreign flags to be raised from 2 to 4*fr.*

2. Algerian productions to be received into France on payment of about half of the duties imposed by the French tariff.

3. Duties on all foreign manufactures contemplated in art. 4 of the preceding regulations (especially wool and cotton goods,) to be raised from 15 to 30 per cent, and to be charged by weight.

Thus, in the 2nd of the new articles, we have the foundations laid down of a reciprocity between the colony and the mother-country, which has been developed so largely by more recent acts, and seems likely to form the basis of all future systems for some time to come. The Republic had no sooner been established, than the affairs of Algeria

were subjected to increased enquiry, and nothing was left undone to arrive at the best course to be pursued. In 1849 a commission was charged by the War Minister to examine into the state of the colony. Another special commission was appointed by the 'Assemblée législative.' Numerous debates, speeches, and discussions, took place at the Luxembourg, of the Council-General of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, under the presidency of M. Dumas. Among those who spoke on the side which eventually prevailed, were, General Daumas, a name already familiar, and then commissary of the government: M. C. Dupin, president and reporter of the commission: but, above all, M. Dufaure, and M. Passy, who greatly distinguished themselves by their views upon political economy. And it was in the spirit of those views that the 3rd period was inaugurated by the law of January 11, 1851, of which the following will be found a summary:—

1. All natural products of Algeria that are enumerated in a table appended, to enter France duty free.

2. Power given to the Executive to admit free any others that might afterwards appear desirable.

3. Carpets, pipes, burnouses, and other native manufactures, to be likewise duty free as regards France.

4. Foreign goods, of the nature of provisions, building materials, and other articles of the first necessity, to be admitted into Algeria duty free, with the exception of corn, which was subjected to the duties of the French tariff.

5. Foreign manufactures, coming under article 3 of the regulations of 1843, to be still charged as there directed.

6. Foreign iron to pay half of the duties imposed in the French tariff.

7. Goods prohibited in the French tariff still to be allowed to enter at a duty of from 20 to 25 per cent.

Hitherto trade by land with Tunis and Morocco had been interdicted; a decree of August 11, 1853, re-opened it. Finally, a custom-house ordinance of July 26, 1856, gave power to the Executive to decree, provisionally, the free importation into France, of manufactured goods not comprised in the law of 1851.

Let us now examine the figures which belong to these different periods: In 1835 the value of imports and exports amounted together only to 20 million francs. In

1845 it reached 83 millions, of which 75 were imports, and but 8 exports, the foreign share of the whole being upwards of 40, or one half. In 1846 (which was signalized by a great increase in the army, then raised to 100,000 men,) the imports rose to 111 millions, of which two-thirds were French, while the exports had also risen to 9 millions, but here 4 only were for France, and 5 for foreign destinations. Down to the present year importations between France and Algeria, average, it is said, 85 millions, and exports 35; between Algeria and foreign countries, exports are given at 6, and imports upwards of 18 millions.\* It is easy to deduce corollaries from these figures. Down to the year 1845 foreign trade was encouraged, and got the start of France; but from the time that the regulations of 1843 got into play, the tide turned, and France began to have the lion's share, which she has kept ever since. It may be asked, on the other hand, has commerce advanced as rapidly since this has been the case, as it did, and seemed likely to do, previously? The steady advance of exports upon imports betokens something like progress in the colony.

We are indebted mainly for the above 'résumé' to a well-written paper in the '*Revue des deux mondes*,'† by M. G. Lavollée, though we have not taken his figures on trust, or without convincing ourselves of their general impartiality. And we are equally disposed to accept upon mature consideration, the correctness of his deductions. The existing regulations may be described in a few words as a system of free trade between the colony and the mother-country, without absolutely interdicting the former from trade with foreigners. We believe it to be no less sound in argument, than borne out in precedent, to assert that, as a general rule, colonial tariffs are framed upon the model of tariffs already existing in the mother-country; and that consequently before establishing absolute free-trade in Algeria, free-trade must have been first accepted in France. We believe such to have been the course of our own colonial administration. '*La metro-*

---

\* We have extracted this last from the *Indicateur General de l'Algerie*; but there must be a typographical error in the sum total, p. 71.

† That of Oct. 15, 1858.

pole,' he proceeds, ' assure à ses colonies un marché privilégié pour leurs récoltes : et elle demande en retour que les colonies consomment de préférence ses produits fabriqués.....'\* It is easy to say that the colony may not particularly care for the free entrance of their goods into the mother-country, having fair prospects of as good a market elsewhere. But while France protects Algeria with a standing army of between 60 and 100,000 men, and, under existing circumstances, the colony would not be safe for a day were it withdrawn,—it is only fair that her interests should be considered, and in all due proportion guaranteed to her ; and that so long as she continues to take all that Algeria is capable of exporting at a remunerative price, the colony should submit to purchase her manufactures in preference to all others, even though, in some respects, they might be had better and cheaper elsewhere. All which consideration is further enhanced by the immense sums which France expends annually for the advancement of the well-being of Algeria, in addition to the protection which her troops afford. Otherwise it might well be made a question whether the commerce of Algeria would not have increased more rapidly by foreign trade, both in the matter of exports and imports, than it has done since its operations have been so materially limited to the mother-country. The figures themselves indicate that such might have been the case, though we are not prepared to say with what foreign countries the bulk of her trade would have been. This would of course have depended on the nature, extent, and quality of her exports, compared with those of other countries more remote ; and upon the nature and quantity of goods which she was capable of consuming in return. Meanwhile this writer shows irrefragably that it would be most unwise to apply the French tariff, in all its rigours, to foreign goods entering Algeria ;† and also that France is sufficiently protected by the regulations which are now in force. Of manufactured cotton goods, for instance, to the value of 20 millions of francs, which were imported into Algeria during 1857, France furnished 16, and foreign countries

---

\* p. 890.

† He particularly instances, iron, steel, timber, agricultural implements, &amp;c.,—why not coal ?

only 4. Of woollen goods to the value of 6 millions, France furnished  $5\frac{1}{2}$  millions, and foreigners but 300,000. Of pottery (the duty being 25 per cent on foreign ware,) the share furnished by France amounted in weight to 721,000 kilogrammes, and by foreigners only to 154,000. On these grounds he would support the existing tariff with some modifications, and he cites M. Duval, and M. Dupré in favour of his views. We believe them to be shared equally by the bulk of the traders of Marseilles and of Algiers; and consequently anticipate no greater changes in the Algerine tariff than such as may be required to give full development to the law of 1851, or the law of the 3rd period.

Thus much for colonization and commerce in the hands of the French Government. It remains to be seen how the colonists themselves have fared. This is, in part, evidenced by their numbers and progressive increase. In 1845, the whole European population amounted only to 75,867. By the end of the year following, it had risen to 109,400; then it retrograded, then increased; then retrograded once more, till finally, in 1850, it rose to be 125,963. The great rise in 1846, has been, with justice, connected with a corresponding increase in the army. "The largest army," says M. Morrell, "that France has ever had in Algeria, was that voted to Marshal Bugeaud, in 1846, amounting to 100,000 French, and 25,000 natives."\*... Again, in 1848, the number of Europeans exceeded the number in 1847, by upwards of 11,000. It was stated in the *Moniteur* two autumns since, that no less than 11,000 had been condemned, in consequence of the events of the month of June, 1848, to be deported into Algeria. It may be true that a majority of these were afterwards pardoned by the President of the Republic, so that only 600 of them remained. But, once more, owing to the events of December 1851, 11,200 were similarly sentenced; and up to the birth of the Prince Imperial, 1058 of these still remained. These are significant facts in the annals of a colony! Between 1850 and 52, population retrograded slightly, probably by reason of those who returned home. From 1853 downwards, there has been a steady increase, till, in 1857, we find the numbers 167,670. But here,

---

\*Algeria, by J. R. Morrell. London: 1854; p. 391.

again, we are compelled to insert a qualification, in one sense disparaging to the numbers; in another sense, a high compliment to the sanitary exertion of the French army before noticed. It consists in the following table of births and deaths. "The births in the three years from 1847 to 1849, were as follows:

	1847.			1848.			1849.		
	French	Foreign	Total	French	Foreign	Total	French	Foreign	Total.
Algiers .....	1380	1141	2521	1307	974	2281	1600	1080	2680
Oran .....	540	478	1018	659	660	1319	795	832	1627
Constantine ...	500	244	744	455	292	747	595	304	899
Total .....	...	...	4283	...	...	4347	...	...	5026.
"The deaths were									
Algiers .....	1683	1283	2966	1416	1097	2513	2112	1806	3918
Oran .....	497	722	1219	698	679	1377	1861	1697	3558
Constantine ...	552	426	978	556	389	945	1916	1101	3017
Total .....	...	...	5163	...	...	4835	...	...	10493*

Thus, in the course of these three years, the deaths always exceeded, and, in one case, the cholera year, actually doubled the births. We are happy to be able to announce that the proportion has changed sides since; for, during† the four years succeeding 1852, the births have exceeded the deaths by 12,771! Thus, allowing it to be true, that the annual increase of the population from 1852 to 56, has been 9000, it would be equally true that upwards of 3000 of these were due to the babes that had been ushered into the world, and are not to be confounded with new settlers. Once for all, these 167,670, have been classed as follows:

French	...	92,738	} 66,544	} 167,670
Spaniards	...	41,237		
Portuguese	...	112		
Italians	...	9,113		
Maltese	...	6,841		
Irish	...	138		
Belgians	...	464		
Germans	...	5,567		
Poles	...	232		
Swiss	...	1,743		
Greek	...	33		
Diverse	...	1,064‡		

\*Morrell, p. 351.

† Indicateur General de l'Algerie, p. 38.

‡ Ibid. p. 37.



Or, in another point of view :

Men ...	68,095	} 167,670
Women ...	50,199	
Children ...	49,376	

Thus we see that the proportion of French to Spaniards, is but 2 to 1, which is the same proportion that Spaniards bear to the remainder. Consequently, the number of men being under 70,000, we cannot reckon French adults of the male sex, above 40,000; and, of these, very many, we well know to, have been born and bred in Algeria, the offspring of the first settlers. How many more are paid officials, agents of the police, of the custom-house, of the market, of the weights and measures, of the tobacco service, of the domains, mines, and nursery grounds; of the forests, roads, and bridges; of the tribunals, of the mairies, of the prefectures; servants and workmen depending on these establishments; schoolmasters, sworn interpreters, contractors for the army, suttlers, shop-keepers? When these shall have been deducted, how many French males will remain of mature age, who have come professedly as colonists, and who are fairly devoting themselves to the work of colonization, unaided by, and independent of, the government? \* Is it that the French, as a nation, are indisposed to leave home, and found colonies; or is it that impediments are thrown in their way? And yet, from time to time, government *ordains* that *colonists shall be supplied from France*, and charges the prefects of the different departments to look them out, and import them. † A strange way, doubtless, of peopling a colony; and what we should call beginning at the wrong end! However, why do not Germans, Italians, and even Spaniards, flock hither in greater numbers? "Ireland," it has been said, "with its six million of wretched inhabitants, sends, in one year, more emigrants to America than France with its 36 millions, has sent in a score of years,

---

\* Mr. Blakesley reckons the adult male agriculturalist in A. of all nations, at 10,000, p. 418.

† For example, 6000 were decreed to be sent out in 1849. See Morrell, p. 373. In the same way a decree *creates* a town from time to time.

across the Mediterranean.\* But we will not institute comparisons, both because Ireland is very differently situated from France, and because, undoubtedly, emigration, both to the United States, and to Australia, has been unnaturally wrought upon by the gold-diggings. We will judge of Algeria solely by her own figures, her own circumstances, and her own regulations. The first inducement held out to the candidate for emigration, is a free passage from Marseilles, for himself and his household goods. So far so good. There are certain formalities to be gone through previously, to be sure, but the boon is never withheld; and nobody can complain of the accommodation of the French boats of the Messageries Impériales. But, on his landing, his troubles begin,—he must have a passport! Going to people a wilderness, a place of exile for departed mal-contents—he still must apply for his passport when he lands, as though about to travel through fair France, and carry it about with him till he is fairly installed, or he may get into grief. If he is a superior workman, in addition to his passport, he must be provided with the “livret d’ouvriers,” as in the mother-country. Twenty-five centimes is not a very exorbitant charge for a record so precious, for, unless he has one, he cannot get into employment! Greater care was never taken to make the shoe fit. Its materials must be white paper;† it must be endorsed and countersigned by the proper authorities, and sealed with their seal. In its first pages must be printed, the law which prescribes it, and the penalties attending informality. It must give the Christian and surname of the workman, his age, birth-place, description, and profession. It must state whether he usually works for one, or for many. In the former cases, the name and abode of the master with whom he works, or has worked in the last instance. There are many more specifications, but we are compelled to put them on one side, with “Ohe! jam satis est!” And when this book has been worn out, or lost, he must go through the prescribed formalities for replacing it by a new one. This, in a country where a man is obliged to

---

\* Tricolor on the Atlas, p. 391.

† Guide du Colon publié d’après les documents fournis par le Ministère de la Guerre, p. 48.

get work when and where he can, where towns are few, and those few scarcely formed, and where the outlying colonies are leagues away from those few, and scarcely formed, in the midst of a desert! Is our immigrant a sportsman, he must spend at least two days in some metropolis, to obtain, at a cost of 30 francs, and after interminable formalities, a "*permis de chasse!*" In a country where wild boars, hyenas, panthers, and lions, abound,—where it is always better to be provided with a gun, lest some stray Hajute should be tempted to fathom the depths of your pocket, steal your sheep, rob your garden—you are still bound to go through the same forms as the cockney sportsman in France, and to pay for the right of killing those very wild animals, for the extirpation of which government itself offers rewards, or of filling your larder with game, in a locality where perhaps meat is not always to be had! Or is your immigrant possessed with the idea of setting up works? There is the same "*Quête de commode et incommode*," to be gone through previously that is obligatory both in France and in Belgium. In a country where there is elbow-room in abundance, even in the principal towns, and where, outside them, there are leagues without inhabitants, nobody can choose a site for works, or set them up, till the full preliminary programme has been gone through; notice published, objections heard, advantages set forth, leave given. He cannot, as in England, set up works on his own responsibility, and take the chance of the Arabs, or panthers, or jackalls, inditing him for a nuisance. Then too, he may have just set up his distillery, when a decree is received from France, prohibiting distillation from grain; or else he may be a butcher or a baker, with a small capital, and lo! he is commanded, in the name of the Emperor, either to sell his meat at a reduced price, or else to keep a reserve by him, of corn, or in flour, equal to the quantity required for the consumption of his trade for three months.\* Distillation from grain was recently prohibited in Algeria as well as France; what assurance is there, therefore, that those subsequent decrees respecting butchers and bakers in France, may not be imposed

---

\* See an excellent article thereon in the Times of November 22, 1858. The decree respecting butchers came out in October, 1855.

on the butchers and bakers of the colony? Poor Algeria! it pays dearly for the glory of being "assimilated" to the seat of empire! But is our immigrant a simple colonist, ambitious of a concession of land from government? He gets it upon application to the proper authorities, it is true, but upon what conditions? First and foremost of them all, this—*his means must be made known to the government*; "concessions," says the official guide, "apply to lands not yet under cultivation; and upon colonists themselves fall the whole expenses of installation, and of getting the ground into order. Consequently, concessions are always made in proportion to their means of action duly certified."\* As if it could not be ascertained that a man had capital, without prying into his very account-books. Further conditions of a similar nature are superadded:

"Un délai est fixé pour l'exploitation de chaque concession. A l'expiration de ce délai, si le concessionnaire a mis ses terrains en pleine valeur, il en devient propriétaire définitif au même titre que s'il les avait achetés. S'il les a laissés incultes, il fait retour au domaine de l'Etat. Enfin s'il n'y a exécuté que quelques travaux insuffisants, ils sont vendus aux enchères publiques à son profit, sur une mise à prix égale à la valeur de ces travaux."†

Thus, from beginning to end, there is a system of inquisition on the part of the State, that is truly vexatious. It grants favours, but on condition of continually looking into your private affairs. It is not enough that a man should have laid before government a statement of his means, but he is pestered without end by domiciliary visits, to see what he is doing, how he is getting on, and whether he will fulfil the terms of his concession. He cannot begin where he will, accelerate what he most wants, leave out what he can dispense with, for a time, at least; he must work according to the rules of a system prescribed by others, and what is still worse, under their surveillance. And the chances are that when he has done, his work will be objected to, and his concession revoked. That such has been the ordinary fate of concessionists, is proved by the fact that concessions have universally gone out of favour for some time past; and officials themselves

---

\* Guide du Colon, p. 57.

† Ibid, p. 58.

advise the purchase of land in preference. They are regarded as parts of a system that has become obsolete ; and the sale of land by public auction is the procedure which the administration is beginning gradually to substitute in their room. Is our immigrant therefore, willing to purchase land from the government ? But a short time ago, this was not so easy. When the "Bureaux Arabes" were in existence, it somehow or other happened, that when Europeans had set their hearts upon a piece of ground, some Kaid or Agha had been beforehand with them. Even Frenchmen complained loudly, that natives were preferred before them ; and it was asserted in our own hearing by one fully competent to speak, that unless the "Bureaux Arabes" were suppressed, the whole of the land would revert to the Arabs ; and the "granary of Italy" would continue to be the wilderness that for twelve centuries it had already been in their hands. Our immigrant usually found it the best policy to buy rather from individuals, than from the government. Some ruined concessionist, some covetous old Moor, supplied his best chance. We would fain hope for Algeria ; nevertheless, unless the French government will cease legislating for Algeria as for France—will cut down formalities, abstain from surveillance, allow individuals to go where they please, project what they please, do what they please, so long as they do not violate the public peace, unmolested by police, and unfettered by restrictions ; it is quite certain that there will never be colonists in sufficient numbers to people the country. Englishmen will not come, for they have already got all the liberty that they could desire, in their own happy land, and in their vast colonies. Germans, Italians, Swiss, Spaniards, will not come, because with them, one principal reason for abandoning fatherland, is, that they may be more free. Liberty is the only price for which they are content to barter hearth and home. The Continent is tied up with artificial restrictions ; but better, far better, for Europeans to remain in

---

\* It has been quaintly, but truly observed : "It is over-nursing which chokes the African plantation."—*Tricolor* on the Atlas, p. 397. See an excellent paper by M. Duval, in the *Journal des Economistes* 2me Serie 4e Année, especially the end p. 373.

their own country, under those with which they are already familiar, than to come to Algeria to be bound, hand and foot, by restrictions, which have the additional burdensomeness of being strange and foreign. It may be otherwise with Frenchmen who have known them from childhood.

But then, lastly, how can France supply colonists under her existing laws?—with her stationary population, and where every male that is born, is liable to service in the army. From his cradle, every Frenchman knows that a military profession is the one to which his country binds him; and that unless the lot shields him, or money can find him a substitute, he must abandon every other secular vocation or pursuit in life, to be a soldier, when the time comes. He cannot claim exemption on the ground that he is preparing to be a colonist—has he emigrated without satisfying the law first, he is liable to be recalled home;\* and when his seven years of service are over, he is no longer the fittest subject to go forth as a colonist, let his intentions remain ever so fixed. It is not, therefore, that Frenchmen are naturally unfitted for colonization or for commerce; it is their system of conscription that unfits them. Its operations are felt most just by the very class that would otherwise become colonists or merchants. The lot hangs over them, like the sword of Damocles, and they can settle to nothing till its issues are known. Up to the age of 20, they can fix upon nothing in life. Also, there is an attractiveness in the military profession, which makes them resign themselves to the necessity of even its uncertainty; but once soldiers, there is an end of the colonist and of the merchant, compared with what otherwise they might have achieved in their case.

---

\* We are indebted to an eminent legal authority for the following data. 1. Le recrutement n'existe pas en Algérie, même pour les Français. A plus forte raison, pour les colons étrangers. 2. Un Français qui va fixer son domicile en Algérie, avant d'avoir satisfait à la loi du recrutement, n'en reste pas moins soumis aux obligations de cette loi. 3. L'exemption de recrutement en Algérie doit s'entamer en ce sens, qu'elle s'applique, soit aux Français nés en Algérie, soit aux Français mineurs à l'époque où leur parents sont venus se fixer en Algérie à titre non précaire...."



But the stagnant character\* of the population of France is a still more serious impediment to colonization, especially when the system that engenders it, is extended to the colony. There, at least, the "*jus trium liberorum*" would answer even better than a prize for cotton or tobacco. Why engraft the great social evil of France upon a new country? The French are proud of their Napoleonic code; and it has certainly the merits of system, conciseness, and freedom from obsolete legislation. But we tell them that the intentions, which it embodied, are not for the advancement of liberty, but the perpetuation of despotism! One of its favourite affectations is, that it has annihilated, at one blow, the monstrous principle of primogeniture, the preference of male issue, and the system of entails. It has done all these things effectually, we grant; *but has it left a man in any one sense more free to do what he will with his own?* And what other influences has it *not* crushed besides aristocracy? Evidently it was not the intention of their legislature merely to cut down every tall poppy, but to reduce every flower in the garden to the same proportions. Plutocracy, or moneyed pre-eminence, is even more rudely dealt with by the French code, than aristocracy; and nobody, who has studied those enactments, can fail to see that the object of the legislature, was to cut down every powerful influence between the masses and the supreme head of the government. And wonderfully well has this end been achieved, under the plea of annihilating aristocracy; for the French nation, at the present day, present the largest aggregate

\* The population of France during four periods of five years, was

In 1836 :	in 1841 :	in 1846 :	in 1851.
33,540,910.	34,230,178.	35,400,486.	33,783,170.

Between 1836 and 1850, the births were {  
 1836-40.....959,431.  
 1841-45.....976,630.  
 1846-50.....949,594.

On the other hand, the following is said to have been the average of births between 1771-84, the whole population at the end of the preceding century (Encycl. Brit, vol. x., art. France, p. 276) having been found to be about 20,000,000. {  
 1771-80.....940,935.  
 1781-84.....964,924.

So that with a population increased by at least 10,000,000, the births stand pretty much as they did a century back. Journal des Ecom. 2me. serie. 4me. année. p. 351-69.

of intelligent little nobodies to be met with in the world. Every one is, by law, just as big as his neighbour, and no bigger; and it is only those, who are in the employment of the government, who are enabled to raise their heads above their brethren. Independent men of wealth and capital they have none, as a general rule; for the moment that a man accumulates a fortune, it is the due of his children, if he have any; and neither by marriage settlement, gift during his lifetime, nor testament after his decease, can he prevent all of it being cut up at his death into almost as many portions as there are children. To be able to dispose of more than a fourth part as he pleases, he must have less than three children; to be able to dispose of the half of it, he cannot allow himself more than one child. Such is the law of succession in the boasted code! Never was social equality purchased at a greater sacrifice of individual liberty. Large capitals, therefore, and large families are, as logicians would say, in contradictory opposition under the Code Napoleon. They have been found irreconcilable in France; but which of the two a rising colony can best do without, is a problem, which the ruin of all French colonies, from the want of both equally, will leave unsolved. It will be enough to point out a few of the baneful effects of this arbitrary law upon a noble people, which the French certainly are:—

1. The numerical decrease, or, at all events, stagnation, of the population of France, for some time past, the births hardly exceeding the deaths.—
2. The dearth of capital, for it is only made to be unmade, and never can be kept together beyond a single life, unless there is but one child to inherit.—
3. The horrible expedients to prevent child-birth after marriage, now unhappily so common in France, when this one child has been born.—
4. The total absence in France, of all that we call private or family collections of pictures, works of art, historical curiosities, libraries, and the like, at least, such as are not merely ephemeral.—
5. The total absence of any independent powerful influences between the masses, and the head of the government, save perhaps, but only perhaps, that of the army.—
6. The utter inability of individuals to embark in any scheme of importance without help from the government; and, consequently, the want of self-reliance, and of independence of action, that is thereby engendered. All these drawbacks to national prosperity Algeria is beginning to

feel, and will continue to feel, till they are removed, or till they involve her ruin. She cannot get capital from France; for who can impart that which he has not to give? and under the Code Napoleon, she will never be able to accumulate capital in her own borders. She cannot get colonists from France, where large families are wanting; neither will French colonists in Algeria increase and multiply for the same reason that exists in the mother country. From our own experience, we should say that there were not two in five Frenchmen out there, who were not in the employ, either of the government, or the municipality. When Napoleon III. tried to alter the law and create a majorat in the case of the Duc de Malakoff, it was for the sorry purpose of bolstering up a paltry title of his own creation; and he met with the opposition which the attempt deserved. Let him propose a law enabling every man to do what he will with his own throughout France, and he will probably meet with better success, and more important results. For why should not France have large families, and large capitalists, and large colonies, as well as England?

We conclude, therefore, by repeating: 1, that towards the native population the acts of the French government have been characterized by wisdom and moderation, though we do not feel certain that they will meet with the entire success that they deserve, or attain to the results that have been anticipated.\* 2. That the general measures adopted by the French government for the security of life and property in Algeria, have been excellent, and that, by a series of internal improvements, that country has been admirably laid out for the purposes of colonization. But then, we say further, that the application of the laws of the mother-country to the colony, will, if persevered in, annihilate the good results that would otherwise have ensued; and that invitations will be issued in vain to European settlers, if their liberty is to be placed under the same restraints, and subjected to the same

---

\* 'Par elle (Algérie) nous devons montrer a nos detracteurs que nous sommes capables non seulement de fonder et d'organizer une colonie, mais encore de nous assimiler la race indigène, au point que, sur un sol conquis, on ne reconnaitra plus les vaincus!'.....  
*Revue des deux Mondes*, Oct. 15, 1858, p. 889.

system of espionage, that is deemed necessary in the over-developed and highly artificial state of society throughout France. Lastly, we say, that as long as the conscription, and the laws regulating the succession of property, remain in their full force in France, she never can hope to be the mother of a colonizing or commercial people.

We have endeavoured to treat these subjects with the utmost impartiality, and have purposely abstained from instituting comparisons that might excite prejudice. It is our sincere wish to offer suggestions in a friendly spirit; and should our criticisms provoke stricture, our spontaneous answer would be, 'Strike, but hear.' Meanwhile let us not hesitate to recommend to our countrymen not to pass over Algeria in their polyplanetic travels. For the invalid, for the sportsman, for the ethnologist or antiquarian, it offers a world of attractions, and can be traversed securely in the midst of French refinements, and with economy. A reverend author, not inexperienced in the arts of the 'chasse,' or of the 'cuisine,' may be quoted for experiences of Algiers in 1857. First his table of climatology.

" Winter, ... ..	62.13°*
Spring, ... ..	61.04°
Summer, ... ..	75.09°
Autumn, ... ..	78.26°

"The mean temperature of Algiers for the whole year being 62.13°, it approaches that of Malta, but exceeds it by 2°, Malaga by 3°, Madeira by 4°, Rome by 9°, Nice by 10°, and Pau by 13°. Cairo is 3° higher (mean): yet its winter is 4° colder than that of Algiers."

Next the sanitary state of the towns.

"From three to five in the morning the Arab scavengers swept the streets, and carried off the refuse of the city on their unshod and noiseless donkeys.....It is quite sufficient evidence against Homer that he never visited Algiers as it now is, or he would not have failed to give it the happy distinction it so well deserves, that of the well-scavenged city....."†

Then the account of his 'ménage.'

\* Algiers in 1857, by the Rev. E. W. L. Davies, p. 3.

† Ibid, p. 20.

"For two rooms, comfortably furnished, but of small dimensions, (in the *Rue d'Orléans*, 'not perhaps the most fashionable, and 'au seconde,') with a yet smaller kitchen, we paid 60*f.* a month, for which sum, in advance, linen, crockery, cooking, and attendance, were included.....The fish they sold was good and cheap, that is to say, cheap, if you bought it at half the price they asked for it, and good, if you visited the market at the right time. For instance, weather permitting, a pair of soles, a foot long, might be bought for one franc; a John-dory (*St. Pierre*) large enough for four persons, at ten sous; small red mullet (*rouget*) at a sou each; and sardines, fresh and delicious, at three sous a pound; besides, there were whiting, herring, mackerel, turbot, white-bait, and flying-fish. Then, in the vegetable market, green peas were to be had all the winter; wild asparagus, and new potatoes in February, and Alpine strawberries, besides all the vegetables, and many more, than we have in England, in great profusion and excellence. Game of almost every kind, from a quail to a wild boar, found its way to Algiers throughout the year.....Coffee, as prepared by the native Moors, excellent.....good cow's milk at eight sous a quart; goat's milk, fresh, regular, and abundant, always obtainable at your very doors....."—pp. 16-19.

The general security of the traveller.

"It will be satisfactory to the traveller to learn, that with the exception of those districts in Kabylia which have not yet acknowledged the supremacy of the French arms, and from all accounts they are now but few, he may wander with the utmost security from one end of Algeria to the other; from Tunis to Angad-du-Tell, on the confines of Morocco; from the Mediterranean Sea to the tribe of Beni-Mzal, on the borders of the Great Desert. This security is of course wholly due to French management."

Mr. Davies, though a clergyman of the Established Church, has placed first and foremost among his proofs of the possibility of successful colonization, when undertaken in a spirit of manly perseverance, in a land at once so favoured and so well assured, the great Trappist establishment of Staoheli, his description of which carries us back to the agricultural triumphs of the Benedictines in the Middle Ages, and to the foundation of our own glorious, though now alas! dismantled abbeys. We shall make no apology for extracting somewhat copiously from the interesting chapter which contains it.

"At a distance of eighteen kilometres, or less than twelve English miles from Algiers, on the road to Koleah, stands the grand monastery of La Trappe, consecrated in 1843, containing ninety brethren of that society, and presided over by P. Marie François

Régis, Abbé de Staoheli. It is situated on a wide plain, on which the palmetta grows in luxuriance, and which, from its high and airy elevation, would be selected as the spot of all others where rude health might be enjoyed. But, until it was well drained by the indefatigable monks, it was found to be far otherwise; miasmatic vapours prevailed alarmingly, and these, aided by the rigorous and self-denying diet of the monks, carried them off in vast numbers. At present, however, to judge by their ruddy faces, and indeed by their own account of the place, it is as healthy as any part of the world.....

"The establishment at Staoheli is sufficiently remarkable in its features to require no surreptitious aid to render it an object of the deepest interest to every thinking mind; and it is impossible for any one to visit it without pleasure and advantage to himself.....

"The monastery is a plain, square building, distinguished by no architectural pretension whatever; it has an open quadrangle in the centre, which is ornamented by many curious flowers, orange trees in full bearing, and a fountain of clear and beautiful water, in which gold and silver fish sport in their element. Spacious out-buildings, intended for farm and other purposes, are attached to the monastery; while outside of these a high wall, encompassing one hundred acres of garden, vineyards, orchards, and cemetery, surrounds the home enclosure. Beyond this again, the cultivated farm encircles the whole, in a ring fence, by the produce of which the establishment is maintained, and the simple wants of the brotherhood amply supplied."—p. 63, and seq.

Mr. Davies, however, omits to state that their revenues had become so considerable as to have excited great jealousy on the part of the less fortunate colonists, and created a general outcry against some immunities granted by the government to these industrious monks. He next visited the convent in detail, was much impressed with the devotions which he witnessed in the chapel, and then, after an excellent breakfast, on which he passes a handsome eulogy, goes over the farm and grounds.

"Our next object after breakfast was to look over the farm, and to see how they practised the doctrine taught by the big book in the library. The crops of wheat were the most favoured of the cereals, and were in strong and promising condition; but the seed had been broad-cast, and whether from rabbits or bad sowing, presented a somewhat patchy appearance. The barley was thin and scarcely covered the nakedness of the ground; but the vines, which occupied at least forty acres, seemed to be thriving, and from the clean and well hoed furrows, gave every indication of good management. The grape-blight, '*oudium tuckeri*,' for which sulphur is proved to be a specific, had committed no ravages here. The arti-



ficial grass, for the land had not long been 'laid down,' was excellent; the fences, however, were our special admiration, and were such as Captain Lamb's old Vivian, or Lord Waterford's 'the Switcher,' would alone have faced. They were thus formed—outside a row of the cross-thorn acacia, then a row of aloes, then one of prickly pears, and then a broad ditch; a veritable 'cheveux-de-frise,' and a terrible fence to cross under any circumstances. The cattle, in point of size, were finer than any we had yet seen in Algeria, but they were coarse, mouse-coloured beasts, large in bone and rough in their skins. Vernon, however, suggested that probably a thick hairy jacket was a great advantage in a country infested by mosquitoes and the much dreaded æstrus, to which the monk bowed assent. Cocks and hens, for the omelets, swarmed in the farm-yard. There were also a few long-legged pigs, and a capital heap of old stable manure, which a monk was forking over at that very time. Also, at different points in the farm, there were corn-mills with overshot wheels, aqueducts, reservoirs, a bath-house, and lastly lime-kilns, which they burned with the wild olive instead of coal, and the quality of the lime was excellent."...P. 69 and seq.

Even Mr. Blakesley, by no means a friendly critic, speaks to the flourishing condition of some of the other French settlements.

"Jemappes, one of the few successful agricultural colonies of the French, dates from the year 1848 only. Like almost every other village, it is provided with a loop-holed wall, as a defence against any sudden attack of the natives, and its situation is on a low mamelon, in the midst of a very fertile plain, surrounded by hills as yet uncleared. The water is excellent and abundant, and the whole population appeared healthy, cheerful, and thriving. The inn in which I found quarters was a very humble one, but it was perfectly clean, and I got an excellent dinner, and every attention that I could wish. The population of the village is somewhat under 600. There are several Germans among them, and some Maltese, Piedmontese, and Spaniards, but the bulk of the population is French.....My host, who had not a fault to find with his position, and acknowledged that he had grown comparatively rich, told me that he did not intend to stay more than two or three years longer. Yet this is in every respect a prosperous settlement. The soil reminded me in appearance of the lower part of the valley of the Brohl, near Rolandseeke on the Rhine. The people say that it will produce anything whatever, and that as soon as ever a tree is put in it seems to grow as by magic. Two crops of potatoes are produced annually, and three cuttings of tobacco. One man told me that one hundred mulberry trees, on which he had expended only fifty days labour, gave him a silk crop worth 4,000 francs. The vine

and the fig also thrive admirably, and I was informed that the sweet chestnut was the only tree which did not succeed."...p. 260.

In short, scorpions and wild boars formed the only drawback to this favoured locality.

In his way to Constantine the same author passed through the little village of S. Antoine,

"Which is, unlike its neighbours Damremont and Valleeé, extremely prosperous. As at Jemappes, the water is plentiful and good, and the soil favourable to all products except the chestnut. There are thirty 'concessionaires,' all French, whose grants were of not less than five hectares each; but, as elsewhere, the labourers are mostly Germans, Piedmontese, and other foreigners."...p. 270.

The French settlers of course were always talking of returning home when they had amassed sufficient means, just as was formerly the case, when our great colony was in its infancy, with our Australian emigrants.

Mr. Blakesley was justly entranced on his first view of Constantine, "the capital of the Numidian kings.....on the noblest site," in his estimation, "in the whole world." p. 274. His description is well written, and by no means overdrawn. In fact, we have never seen a photograph—of the many that have been taken of it—which conveyed any adequate idea of the grandeur of the reality; and no less faithful is his account of the valley of Hammam Meskon-tin, where he visited "the exceedingly curious (mineral) springs, which throw Carlsbad completely into the shade."

"It is one of the loveliest spots I saw in Africa, and if it ever becomes a fashionable resort, which the Algerian newspapers are continually proclaiming as its approaching destiny, it may be made almost a fairy-land, the abundance of water and the temperature of the soil admitting of the cultivation of even tropical plants." p. 350.

From the remains which exist it was doubtless a far-famed watering-place in the days of the Romans.

In conclusion, we should recommend any of our readers who may be incredulous of the vast resources of a country where Sallust found the means of amassing in a single year a fortune so gigantic as to entitle him to be considered one of the wealthiest of the Romans, only to visit the collection of Algerine productions in Paris,—when open, and where situated, they will learn from Galignani,—and to look through the great work published by the government

at the head of our list. Let it only be taken into consideration that Algeria has not been French territory above a quarter of a century, and that it is still inhabited by three millions of some of the most untameable races under the sun, and we may safely affirm that no traveller who visits Algeria will find the foregoing extracts exaggerated, or will come away without acknowledging his obligations to the French. In their own country they exhibit many native fascinations, but strangers themselves on a new soil, their courtesy and hospitality to the stranger has a genuineness about it which Englishmen, above all others, can appreciate. Nobody that we know of, who has visited Algeria within the last ten years, will deny that Col. Walmsley has hit upon the only assignable cause why it has been hitherto so little frequented by our excursionists, when he says,—

“I wonder more travellers do not turn their winter wanderings towards Algeria, and that a greater portion of that wave of tourists which annually discharges its accumulation of sight-seers over the continent does not break on this African shore. It is true that a sprinkling of English and Germans do get as far as Algiers, drive through the romantic gorges of La Chiffa, and wander among the orange groves of Blidah ; nay, I have even seen the spectacled nose of the English tourist looming large among the mighty cedars of the unrivalled forests of Teniet El Haad. Oran, Bona, and Philippeville, all boast of their little contingent of strangers, some in search of pleasure, some looking after health. But these visitors are not numerous, and considering the great facilities afforded, and the different nature of the scenery and inhabitants from those to be met with in the usual beaten track followed by the ordinary tourist, I cannot help wondering at it. *This must result from the fact that Algeria is almost unknown to the ordinary traveller.*” P. 24.

---

ART. II.—1. *Reisen im Norden.* Von Matthias Alexander Castren. 1855. [*Travels in the North,* By M. A. Castren.]

2. *Reise nach dem Nordosten des europäischen Russlands, durch die Tundra der Samojeden.* Von Alexander Gustav Schrenck. 1854. [*Travels to the North-Eastern parts of European Russia, through the Samojede Tundra.* By A. G. Schrenck.] 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 730-568. Dorpat, 1848, 1854.

THE districts of Russian Europe, east of the White Sea, are even less known than those of Russian Lapland. The English vessels bound to Archangel, approach the shores of the latter country ere they enter the White Sea ; but no sail cheers the eye of the wanderer on the desolate coast which extends from Archangel to the Oural Mountains. No roads traverse this huge extent of country ; no towns are met with, even on its mightiest rivers ; but yet the country is not altogether destitute of inhabitants, though they are a wild and nomade race, and are rarely visited by civilized man. The Samojede of the two Tundra or deserts are now, since the conversion to Christianity of the Russian Lapps, almost the only heathens on this side of the Oural Mountains. Two hundred years ago and more, this wild nation was not unknown to the British merchant ; for we find in the curious volumes of old Purchas, that in 1611, the Anglo-Russian Company of London, under the presidency of Sir Thomas Smith, despatched ships to the Petschora river, to open out a direct commerce with the people on the banks of that great stream. Some of the English adventurers, and among these Josias Logan, and William Pursglove, actually wintered at Pustosersk, and, on their return, gave a full account of their travels. Had the speculation proved a successful one, we should long ere this have exhausted the subject of the Tundra and its Samojedes ; but after 1615, the English ships ceased their voyages, and up to the present day, the nation has continued almost entirely isolated from the rest of Europe. The tract of country inhabited by the Samojedes, extends for about five hundred miles along the northern coast of Russia, from Mesen to the Oural Mountains, on the confines of Asia. It is divided into the greater and the lesser Tundra,

by the great river the Petschora, which, rising in the Ural Mountains, runs for about three hundred miles in a westerly direction, at a distance of about 180 miles from the Frozen Ocean, and then, turning suddenly at Ustzylmsk to the north, enters that sea below Pustosersk. On the west of this great river, is the lesser or Timan Tundra, which extends about 150 miles to Mesen, while east of the Petschora, is the great desert morass of the Bolschemelsk Tundra, reaching three hundred miles and more to the confines of Asia. But the Tundras are not entirely morass; sandy hillocks, perfectly dry, are occasionally to be found there.

“Around us, then, was nothing but the Tundra, an almost dead level of morass thinly sprinkled with bushes, and varied only by a few pools formed on its surface by the rains. But even in summer, this district does not present the usual obstacles to land carriage that might be expected from a morass, for a little way below the surface there is ever the permanently frozen ground ice to support the traveller. The surface is rarely thawed more than a foot in depth, so that the sledges can glide with tolerable facility over the watery grass and moss, though occasionally dry sand hills, and even stony eminences may be met with.”—Schrenck, p. 271, vol. i.

On this dead flat, hardly a tree, except a few miserable pines, is to be observed, though along the banks of the rivers, which lazily wind through the level mossy ground, willows and stunted birch trees, are generally to be found, and are invaluable as providing firewood for the traveller, and as landmarks for the Samojede guides. Over the whole of this waste, the rein deer moss is plentifully distributed, and in no part of Europe are these animals to be found in such numbers. Without the rein deer, the Tundra would be uninhabitable even by the hardy Samojede, for this animal supplies them with almost all the necessities of life. Fifty years ago, there were Samojedes who possessed herds of many thousand rein deer, but since then, the position of the aboriginal inhabitants of this wilderness has lamentably deteriorated. A powerful and more intelligent race, dwelling on the south of the Petschora, has crossed that great river and invaded the territories of the mild and timid Samojedes; and at the time of Schrenck's visit, had become the real lords of the Tundra. These people are the Syranians, nominally Christian, but worse than the worst heathens in their

dealings with the Samojedes. They unite the craft of the civilized Russian with the unscrupulous avarice and violence of the barbarian. Armed with the fire-water, the surest weapon employed by civilized man for the destruction of the savage, the Syranians have gradually, by pretended debts and obligations, reduced the Samojedes to a condition of absolute slavery. Very few of the latter now possess herds of rein deer, and they are gradually being driven further off into the wildest parts of the Tundra by their conquerors. It was about the beginning of the present century that the Syranians crossed the Petschora into the Tundra.

"Here," says Schrenck, "they began to keep small herds of rein deer, obtaining the friendship of the Samojedes by presents of brandy. Their herds rapidly increased, others followed over the great river, and more active measures were soon adopted to increase their riches. For this purpose, the milder and more upright, if we may use the word, employed the all-powerful talisman of brandy which they sold to the Samojedes at a most usurious price, while the bolder spirits entered the tents of the Samojedes, forced their brandy upon the ever willing savages till they were helplessly intoxicated, and then plundered them of all their goods, and drove off their herds into the Tundra out of the reach of their original owners, changing the marks on the deer, so that they could not be recognized. All this went on unknown to the Russian government, for no employé of the cabinet of St. Petersburg entered the desolate Tundra. Many were the deeds of rapine and murder which never reached the ears of the authorities,—they were deeds done in the solitude of the Tundra, and of which the perpetrators did not choose to speak. Some years after, one of the Syranians at Ischma boasted, when intoxicated, that he had once made drunk with brandy the whole of the inmates of a Samojede tent, nine in number, and then murdering them all in their drunken sleep, had quietly taken possession of all their property. In the short space of thirty years, the Samojedes were dispossessed of the greater Tundra, and their vast herds of rein deer had passed into the hands of their invaders. But less acquainted than the Samojedes with the management of the rein deer, the Syranians now felt the necessity of engaging the former as their shepherds and servants. Not content with the ordinary relation of master and servant, they speedily, by additional supplies of the irresistible brandy, made the Samojedes their debtors, until these timid people submitted to become absolutely their slaves."—Schrenck, p. 297, vol. i.

Castren's travels through the Tundra were in the winter season, while Schrenck, who was an ardent botanist,



traversed these desolate regions in the summer. Winter travelling, over the unbroken surface of snow, is undoubtedly the easiest mode of traversing the Tundra. Castren does not seem to have met with a tithe of the difficulties encountered by Schrenck, but, on the other hand, we must not forget that the former was hardened by long residence among the Finnish Lapps, and was, moreover, a Finn by birth, while Schrenck was a native of a more southern region. Castren's lively pen sketches admirably the manners, customs, and ordinary life of the Samojedes, while Schrenck enters more deeply into the natural history of this wild region, and where he speaks of the Samojedes, it is chiefly with reference to their oppression by the Syranians, and the miserable condition to which they have been reduced. The greater Tundra was hardly visited by Castren, who continued his journey to Obdorsk, in Siberia, up the stream of the Petschora, but Schrenck spent the autumn between the Oural mountains and Pustosersk. When Castren wished to set out on his long and adventurous journey, he sought to engage at Mesen a Samojede, to act as interpreter and guide. But all his endeavours to obtain a sober Samojede were unavailing; he could not get one man who possessed sufficient self-command to refrain from ardent spirits for twenty-four hours together. At last one was brought to him, a native of the Kanin Nos peninsula, and who was described by his countrymen as the soberest and wisest man in all the Lesser Tundra.

"The man was brought to me, and at first it really seemed as if he would be useful, but after the lapse of a few hours, he wearied of the confinement, and of my reiterated questions, and pretended to be sick. He threw himself down on the floor of the room, and crept weeping and crying to my feet, and begged that I would spare him, until, wearied of the pitiable sight, I drove him from the door. Shortly after, I saw him lying drunk in the snow before the dram shop. He was not the only one of his nation, however, who had sunk under the besetting sin of his race, for the whole open snow-covered space in front of the temple of Bacchus, was dotted with persons of both sexes, fallen worshippers of the jolly god. All of them lay with their faces prone upon the snow, and many had half recovered from their debauch. The stillness of death reigned among these prostrate heroes and heroines, while the wildest cries rang out from the interior of the dram-shop. But there was no fighting, the utmost good humour and good fellowship prevailed. From time to time half-drunken men rushed out from the dram

shop with a coffee pot in their hands, and walked carefully amid the recumbent Samojedes, fearful lest they should spill a drop of the precious liquid, looking diligently on every side to recognize the sleeping forms of a wife, a mother, a bride, or a friend. As soon as they had found the object of their search, they placed the coffee pot on the snow, and turned the sleeper over so as to bring the face uppermost, and then proceeded to apply the coffee pot to her lips, and allowed the precious liquid to trickle down her throat. Then they carefully turned the patient back into her original position, taking care to cover her face carefully with snow lest it should become frost bitten."—p. 212.

Castren left Meseu on the 19th December, 1842, on his journey into the Tundra, committing himself unhesitatingly to the guidance of the Samojedes. Although these poor people are still, for the most part, heathens, they have yet had, during the last twenty or thirty years, some opportunities of learning the truths of Christianity. The earliest attempt at their conversion, however, do not extend further back than the present generation. In 1822, a Russian priest named Feodor, was sent into the Tundra, and from the favourable report he gave of the disposition of the natives, a regular mission was established by imperial command; and in 1824, the Archimandrite Venjamin, from the Monastery of Siga, was placed in the Tundra with several assistants. The missionary first directed his attention to the lesser Tundra, and made his way to the north east, towards the Kanin promontory, near Sviatoi-nos. Here he baptized some hundreds of the Samojedes, and burned a considerable number of their clumsy hideous wooden idols. In 1825 and 1826, they passed into the greater Tundra, east of the Petschora. Many of the Samojedes whom they visited, listened to their exhortations, and accepted baptism; but others fled before them and even crossed the Oural Mountains into Siberia, rather than adopt the new doctrines. It soon became evident that their fears were greatly fostered by the Syranians and the Russians, dwelling in the Tundra, and about Pustosersk. They justly feared that their tyranny and misdeeds, among the heathen Samojedes, would now be brought under the cognizance of the Russian authorities; they found that the Christianized Samojede had obtained a protector in the Russian mission, and that they could no longer feed their enslaved herdsmen on the animals they lost by sickness, nor force them to eat meat

during the frequently recurring fasts of the Russian Church. All these reasons induced these abandoned tyrants to side with the heathens, and especially to co-operate with the Tadibés, or magicians, who trembled to lose their influence over this simple people. The schaman, or Tadibé, the medicine man of these wild tribes, differs little from the ordinary magician of the savage nations. Their occupation is chiefly to be present at weddings and other solemn occasions, to assist, by their incantations, in the recovery of lost property, and especially in finding rein deer, the great treasure of the Samojedes, when they had wandered from the tents of their masters. Both Castren and Schrenck, constantly met with these magicians, whose influence however, is gradually waning before the advance of Christianity. By the end of 1830, the Mission could exhibit a list of above three thousand converts in the two Tundra. The countries were now divided into three parishes, churches were built and priests appointed to each of these, with an appropriate salary, while store houses of corn and salt were placed under an inspector at each church to attract around it the population. In 1840, it was calculated that out of the 4500 inhabitants of the Tundra, only 700 or 800 continued openly to profess heathenism, but among the converts, there exists a strange mixture of the old and the new doctrines. Long before they accepted Christianity, the Samojedes had received the Russian Saint, St. Nicholas, among the number of their deities; and when offerings to the latter failed to obtain their desired objects, they would have recourse as a last resource, to the all-powerful patron of the Russian Empire, and would even demand baptism as a means of rendering him more propitious. Thus Schrenck tells us, that while he was at the famous temple or offering-place of the Samojedes, on the peninsula opposite to Waygat's island, a spot very accurately described by the old English navigators, he saw a Samojede of the Haruzi tribe, who had vowed sacrifices to the heathen gods, and also to the holy St. Nicholas. He had already sacrificed to the former on Waygat's Island, and now was on his way to Pustosersk to fulfil the vow he had made for the recovery of his wife from illness, to the great Patron Saint of the Russians, to whom he intended to sacrifice no less than ten of his rein deer. Such a journey, without a change of rein

deer, and in the summer season, across five hundred miles of the greater Tundra, was really, as Schrenck observed, fully equal to the hardships of a pilgrimage in ancient times to the Holy Land. The converted Samojedes, however, have learned little of their new faith beyond the making of the Russian sign of the cross on their breasts. Though they occasionally frequent the Christian churches when in their neighbourhood, they also deem it advisable to propitiate the enemy of mankind; for they say: "If we believe that the God of the Christians can help us, we must believe that the devil of the Christians can injure us, let us therefore propitiate him too by sacrifices!" At the present day, heathenism is almost confined to the free Samojedes of the greater Tundra; almost all those who are in service with the Russians and the Syranians, have become Christians. To a nation that subsists almost entirely on animal food, the long and frequent fasts of the Russian Church will be almost intolerable; and, besides this, the polygamy of the free Samojedes, at least of such as are wealthy, is a powerful incentive to retain them in heathenism. Although not general, polygamy is to be met with among those who still possess large herds of rein deer, and one or two of the wealthiest Samojedes indulge in as many as four wives at once.

Castren gives a lively picture of his reception at a Samojede tent in the wild Tundra. It was the dwelling of a heathen Samojede, the father of the driver of his sledge:

"On my arrival at the tent the owner and his wife both came out. I remained standing by the sledge in order to see what kind of a reception I should meet with. At all events I felt sure of an invitation to enter the tent, but I waited in vain. Both the Samojedes remained quite still, the man gazed earnestly on me with his half-shut winking eyes, while his wife looked hard at her husband with occasional glances towards myself. Their son, my driver, quietly took his rein-deer out of the sledge, and then advancing to his parents saluted them with the Russian word 'Torowa.' Both father and mother answered 'Torowa,' and there was an end of the conversation. I then accosted my silent hosts with the like salutation and received a similar response. Then ensued a long pause, till I broke silence by ordering fresh rein-deer to be put to the sledge. I then went up to the tent and opened the door, but within all was dark as the grave. I asked the hostess to light a fire in the tent, but all in vain. Feeling cautiously about the tent I came at last upon a heap of dry branches, and bearing

them to the hearth soon kindled a blazing fire. By its light I observed the presence of a young Samojede girl in a corner of the tent, where she was busily engaged with a lump of frozen flesh. She used no knife in her repast, but fixed her teeth in the savoury morsel, and bit and tore and shook her head over the meat, till her hair fell in the wildest disorder about her blood-red face. From time to time she cast anxious glances at me, till all at once she dropped the meat, sate up and pushed her hair back from her countenance, while her face beamed with joy. I had taken out my snuff-box, and the sight of the metal had produced this immediate change. Meanwhile the rest of the family entered the tent and placed themselves round the fire in the deepest silence. This was broken at length by a wild cry from the girl, who observed a gold ring on one of my fingers. She questioned me as to its value in case I would sell it." (Castren, p. 240.)

The ceremonies both of marriage and of funerals among this wild people are peculiar. Castren gives a lively picture of a Samojede wedding, which however does not greatly differ from the prevailing customs among better known savage nations. But the feast that followed, or rather the climax of that feast, was barbarous in the extreme.

"After tea our host ordered a magnificent rein-deer to be killed. A slight blow on the forehead with an axe laid the beast prostrate on the ground. A knife was then thrust into its heart, and the windpipe was cut out, and a furious contest ensued for this delicate morsel. It was at length decided that it should be cut into strips and distributed to the nearest relatives of the new married pair. The deer was then skinned, the belly cut open, and a portion of the intestines removed, and the animal was then placed upon its back. It then resembled a huge oval bowl, in which the lungs, the liver, and other choice morsels, swam in a sea of blood. The guests crowded around, drawing their long knives, and cut off portions of the yet warm and reeking flesh, dipped them in the blood and conveyed them to their mouths. Here, seizing the savoury morsel in their teeth, they cut off a portion of it close to their lips. The blood ran down their faces and their necks, and, as a dessert, they devoured the lungs and the liver after the same fashion." (p. 256.)

At a similar feast Schrenck observed that after the conclusion of the meal a bundle of shavings was handed round upon which the guests wiped their hands and faces.

The Samojede lives almost entirely on flesh or fish, of which latter the great Petschora river supplies an immense variety. Whether its sandy banks would present attractions to the salmon fisher, for the river swarms with several

species of this noble fish, we have considerable doubts; the want of fall in the course of the Petschora will not allow of those rapids rushing into deep stony pools which delight the eye of the veteran angler. Even if it were possible to kill salmon with the rod on the Petschora or its tributaries, the distance of the journey would intimidate our boldest anglers, for to reach the Petschora when the ice breaks up at the end of May, it would be necessary to leave St. Petersburg in the middle of March.

Besides the flesh of the rein-deer the Samojedes kill thousands of geese during the period of moulting, when the birds cannot fly. Schrenck has given an admirable description of these singular wild goose hunts, as observed by him on the Kolwa, a tributary of the Petschora, flowing out of the greater Tundra. On his journey down this river he frequently fell in with large flocks of wild geese undergoing the moulting process, and consequently unable to escape by taking wing. On observing the boat the birds swam to the shore, and if followed betook themselves to the land, running at great speed over the banks, where, however, they were soon overtaken by the boatmen and knocked down with sticks. If there were bushes on the banks they frequently escaped pursuit by hiding, but not unfrequently the stupid birds contented themselves (as is fabled of the ostrich) with merely hiding their heads in the foliage, leaving their bodies uncovered. The goose hunts take place annually between the first and twentieth of July upon the Kolwa and neighbouring rivers.

“Three or four hunters, accompanied by dogs, proceed in a boat up the river nearly to its source before commencing operations. During the moulting season the geese generally congregate about the rivers for the purpose of more easily procuring food, and they are generally to be found on the banks in flocks of six to twelve individuals. Upon the approach of men they either take to the water or to the banks for concealment. The boat, with one or two of the hunters, is floated slowly down the river, while the others with the dogs drive the geese from the banks into the water, where, believing themselves in safety, they float slowly down the current. The boat follows at a distance, keeping the ever increasing flock in sight, while the dogs, which are well trained to their work, carefully prevent the geese from returning to either bank. If, on their downward journey, the hunters come to a tributary stream, on the banks of which more of the game is likely to be found, they follow it up for a certain distance, and drive the geese down from its



banks to the main river, where the affrighted new comers hasten to join the main flock, and the whole proceed further down before the boat. As, however, the continuous journey, which often lasts for several days, would be too arduous for the hunters, and as the geese, by continual driving and anxiety might lose some of their condition, the voyage is so arranged that they reach about nightfall some low grassy spot. On arriving here the boats, dogs, and men, draw off out of sight, and the hungry weary geese instantly betake themselves to feed, and afterwards, without wandering, seek repose upon the spot, as they believe themselves no longer pursued. Meanwhile the hunters too have taken their night's repose, and with the early morning they again surround the resting-place and drive the geese into the water, when the boat again follows at a distance and the dogs resume their active vigilance. Thus the 'drive' continues day by day, the flock of geese receiving fresh augmentations in its progress down the river, till it arrives near the mouth of the stream, where due preparations have been made for the capture of the birds. For this purpose the hunters make choice of a portion of the river where the banks on either side are high and perpendicular, with a narrow strip of flat land between the cliffs and the water. While the other hunters have been up the river on the 'drive,' those who remain below make, on one of the sides of the stream, a circular enclosure surrounded by nets and stakes, and with a single small opening looking up the river. This aperture in the stake-net is about two or three feet from the ground, and access to it is gained by two or three boards which form an inclined plane up to it, and are covered with grass and turf. These boards extend from the flat bank into the opening, and, at the edge of the latter, are laid down a quantity of flexible willow rods, which give way as soon as they are trod upon and precipitate the geese into the enclosure. On the one side of the opening, nets are stretched to the base of the cliffs, on the other they extend for some distance into the river. Having completed his preparations, the hunter withdraws on the approach of the flock, to some little distance down the river, where he conceals himself in the bushes, and when the geese come in sight, he stretches out a long white rod before the astonished birds. As the boat is behind, and the white wand indicates danger in front, the timid birds betake themselves to the low shelving shore beneath the cliffs, and on that side on which the nets are placed, as the dogs and men now begin to appear on the opposite bank. The perpendicular cliffs prevent their escaping directly into the forest, and the geese run along their base till they come to the nets. Soon the aperture leading into the enclosed stake net is perceived, one or two of the leading birds eagerly avail themselves of it, they dart in, and falling through the bending willow rods into the enclosure, are lost to the sight of their companions. These, of course, follow eagerly, and the whole flock, often consisting of 1500

or 2000 birds, is soon within the net, and is speedily disposed of by the hunters."—(p. 267).

Among wild animals, the bear is the most frequent and most dreaded inhabitant of the Samojede Tundra. On the northern coast, the white or Polar bear is by no means uncommon, and both species are regarded with dread, and, like the devil of the Christians, are worshipped or propitiated to avert danger from their ravages. Occasionally, the brown bear, when pressed by hunger, makes his way into the tents of the Samojedes,—and there are instances where the animal has destroyed the whole of the inmates. While the church on the Kolwa river was being built, bears were very plentiful and troublesome in the vicinity, and the Russian priest there informed Schrenck, that a year or two before, a bear had visited the tent of an old Samojede, who was much distressed on his return that he had not been at home to receive his grisly visitor. The Samojede, like the Finn, is not afraid to encounter the bear in single combat, armed with his long spear, or even with his knife alone, and not unfrequently he comes off victorious in the contest. On the Kolwa, the bear is fond of rein deer flesh, and will even attack man, but there is no instance known of horned cattle, which have been lately introduced there, having been attacked by these animals. In other countries, where they are not of such recent importation, horned cattle do not escape the ravages of the bear. When a Samojede hunter shoots a bear, he never boasts of his exploit, for fear of the vengeance of the spirit of the dead animal, but he carefully conceals his prize. There is no greater harbinger of evil than the accidentally treading on a portion of bear's fur. Their most solemn oaths are taken by cutting an incision with a knife in a piece of bear skin; and there are very few instances on record of so solemn an obligation having been disregarded. Can it be true, as Schrenck assures us is the case, that the few individuals who have broken this oath, have actually perished by being eaten by bears?

Although the Samojede cannot resist the temptations of ardent spirits, he yet looks upon intemperance as a crime, and they even call the Christian Sunday, Sin-day, as the Russians and converted Samojedes too often spend that day in intemperance and rioting. One of the few remaining holy places of the heathen Samojedes was visited by Schrenck. It is perhaps the last heathen temple existing

in Europe, and seems almost unchanged since it was visited and described by Stephen Burrough, in 1556. It is situated at the Bolvanskoi Noss, on Waigat's Island. It is, however, no temple built with stones by the hand of man, but a perforation in the cliffs caused by the ceaseless action of the waves. Where this perforation, which extends from the coast inland, reaches the sea, a narrow platform and space exist directly overhanging the waves, and this wild spot has been for ages the sacred temple of the old Samojede gods. In 1824, the Russian Mission first reached this spot. Many of the heathen Samojedes had fled before it, some crossing the desert into Siberia, while others took refuge on the northern side of Waigat's Island. The missionaries did their best to destroy the reputed sanctity of the place. They burned the images of the gods, rude figures cut in wooden stakes to the image of a man, and planted the cross directly over the old site of the temple. But difficulties arose in their progress; the heathen Samojedes refused to supply them with rein deer, and they soon found themselves obliged to leave the spot, and betake themselves further south. On their departure, the heathen natives returned, and restored, as far as in their power, the images of their gods, which no missionary has since disturbed. The cross of the Christian still stands upon the wild promontory, but the wildest pagan rites are celebrated in its immediate vicinity. Schrenck found the idols of the Samojedes ranged there in groups, and consisting of stakes of wood three or four feet in height, on which were cut the rudest possible images of the human face. The mouths of these idols were besmeared with the blood of the sacrifices, the skulls, antlers, and hoofs of the sacrificed rein deer, were piled up around them, but all the other bones had been carefully removed.

The bones of the great primæval inhabitants of this Arctic Zone, the Arctic elephant and the mammoth, are but rarely found on the European side of the Oural Mountains. The Samojedes denominate them the bones of the "subterranean rein deer," a gigantic beast, which has its "runs" and passages beneath the earth, and which rarely appears above ground at the present day. If they find any of the bones or tusks, they are unwilling to touch them, and prefer to indicate their locality for a small reward to the Russians or Syranians of the Tundra, who are deterred

by no scruples from appropriating the precious ivory. The greater part of this ivory is transported down the Pinega to Holmogory, and Archangel, where it is manufactured by natives and untaught artists, into the most beautiful caskets and other articles of luxury, which are sold at high prices in St. Petersburg. The Samojede woman, as in most barbarous nations, is kept in a state of abject slavery. She dares not eat with her lord and master, she must avoid certain parts of the tent, her whole life is as laborious as that of an Indian squaw. Rude, however, as the Samojede undoubtedly is, there are occasional examples among the heathen natives of a charity and generosity that might be sought for in vain among the Russians and Syranians of the district.

"Our host, a heathen Samojede," says Schrenck, "entertained us with the history of his life and adventures, the principal details of which would apply to many of his unfortunate race. He was formerly a wealthy nomade Samojede, for he possessed a herd of 1500 rein deer; but when the Syranians crossed the Petschora, and spread themselves over the Tundra, and effected the ruin of all the Samojedes with whom they came in contact, his tents became a refuge for his impoverished countrymen, who came to seek, at the hands of their wealthy neighbour, that assistance which the Samojede never refuses when it is in his power. Gradually, by his lavish gifts to his starving neighbours, he became so reduced in circumstances, that he now did not own more than thirty rein deer. By withdrawing in the summer to the Island of Warandei, in the Frozen Sea, he had escaped the overt acts of robbery committed by the Syranians; but on this isle, he fell into the hands of the Russian merchants, who annually visit it for purposes of trade, and who, by the aid of brandy, succeeded in depriving him of almost all his remaining possessions. Yet still this poor fellow had actually just returned from Pustosersk, where he had been providing both provisions and money for some orphans of Russian parents, not, as he said, out of love for that nation, for he hated them with his whole heart, but to do honour to the Russian God!"—(p. 516).

The medical knowledge of the Samojede conjurors is on a par with their savage religious ceremonies. A favourite idea among the natives, when they are afflicted with any internal malady, is, that a worm has located itself in the part where pain is felt, and is slowly destroying the interior organs. The conjuror, after many magic ceremonies, proceeds to make an incision in the skin, and to extract the worm, availing himself of a large earth-worm concealed

in the ample sleeve of his "malizia," to impose on the wondering bystanders. Directly that the cut is made, he pretends to pluck forth the worm, casts it on the ground, divides it into two parts with a stroke of his knife, and instantly devours the one half, while the other moiety is burnt or buried with additional ceremonies. After a summer spent in the wild wastes of the greater Tundra, where the lakes were often frozen, even in the month of August, Schrenck returned to Pustosersk on the Petschora, in autumn. This town was formerly of much greater magnitude; it now consists of only about forty families, but it contains no less than four churches, though two of these are very old and almost in a ruinous condition. Most of the inhabitants, too, adhere to what is called the old Russian party in ecclesiastical matters, and therefore refuse to frequent the modern Russian service, contenting themselves with meeting privately for prayer. The Russian government has here also erected magazines of salt and flour, and it would be well if no other article were sold therein. Unfortunately, the demand for brandy far exceeds that for bread among the Samoiedes, and many thousand gallons of spirits are annually here consumed, to the utter ruin of the poor natives.

From Pustosersk, Schrenck pursued his homeward journey along the northern coast of the lesser Tundra. The limits of the forest vegetation, towards the north, have receded considerably during the present century. According to the account of the inhabitants, the pines all perished by the tremendous frost of the year in which the French were in Russia (1812). On the Indega river, the pines were entirely destroyed, but whole woods of dead trees were still standing. The Russian householder, on the banks of the Indega, was surrounded with many of the comforts of civilization, he possessed a herd of above a thousand rein deer, and made large profits from the sea coast, which supplied his hunters with walrus and seals. The Greenland seal, the great object of chase further to the east, rarely appears at the mouth of the Indega, but the walrus and the common seal, come in June with the drift ice. To obtain these animals when lying on the ice, the hunters make use of a white wooden screen which they push before them till they arrive within shot. The white "fish," (beluga) appears in flocks of 50 or 60 individuals off the mouth of the river, in June or July, and ascends

the stream with the tide. From the look-out stations, established on the river, the advance of the flock is telegraphed higher up the stream, and boats put off to turn the "fish" down towards the sea. Here, however, their retreat is cut off by another fleet of boats, which drive the flock towards the shallow sand banks of the river, and gradually enclose it in a huge net of 700 fathoms long, and about two fathoms in depth, which is stretched between two of the longest boats. The net is made of rope of the thickness of the finger, and the meshes are more than a foot in diameter. As the tide falls, the "fish" touch the ground, and are gradually enclosed in the net, when they are killed with lances and dragged on to the land before the tide again covers the sand banks. The excitement of these chases is great, but it is far inferior to the whale hunts in the Feroe and Shetland isles, where a somewhat similar fish, the *delphinus deductor*, is driven on shore out of deep water on to the sandy terminations of the bays. As many as a thousand of these "fish" have been captured at one drive in Shetland. They are about fifteen or twenty feet in length, and are worth, on the average, about fifty shillings each to the fortunate captors.

Eastward of the Petschora, the pursuit of the Greenland seal on the drift ice, that sets in from the Polar regions, is one of the main occupations of the inhabitants of Mesen in the spring months. The seals herd together on the drift ice in enormous numbers at this period of the year, but the drift ice is ever moving, and after remaining for a few tides off the coast, it floats away to the north east, towards the coast of Nova Zembla. Besides the terrific hardships endured by the hunters from the intense cold, and the difficulty of making their way over the ice hummocks, difficulties so feelingly spoken of by every Arctic voyager, there is ever a danger that storms may arise, and may hurry the drift ice on which they have taken up their position, out into the Frozen Sea. Every year lives are lost in this hazardous occupation, and even in the best of seasons, the gain is comparatively small, but the excitement of the chase ever enlists fresh hunters, though it is complained that the number of the seals is annually diminishing.

We have not, in our brief notice of these countries, touched upon the Flora or the geology of the Tundras.



The former as may well be imagined in so northern a region, where snow covers the ground for nine months in the year, is scanty enough, and the position of the strata has been but imperfectly examined, though a good deal of attention has recently been paid to it by European geologists. We trust we have extracted enough from the volumes before us to shew, that though wild and savage in the extreme, the Tundras and their inhabitants are not wholly devoid of interest. As the last heathen race in Europe, the Samojedes are worthy of our attention; as an oppressed and wronged nation, groaning under the tyranny of the invading Syranians, this mild and timid people has a claim upon our sympathy.

---

- ART. III.—1. *The Catholic Case Stated.* By a Catholic Layman. Dublin: John Mullany, 1 Parliament Street.
2. *Six Letters to a Cabinet Minister on the Education Crisis in Ireland.* By James W. Kavanagh, Esq. Published by the Catholic Book-selling and Publishing Company, 61, New Bond Street, London.
3. *The Board of Education*, and its present assailant, and late Panegyrist, the Author of the "Catholic Case Stated." Alexander Thom and Sons, Dublin, 87 and 8, Abbey Street.
4. *A Reply to a book called "The Catholic Case Stated,"* with a postscript. Dublin: McGlashan and Gill, 50, Upper Sackville Street.
5. *A Letter to the Right Honourable Alexander Macdonnell.* By the Rev. E. A. Stopford, Archdeacon of Meath.
6. *Mixed Education.* "The Catholic Case" and its Catholic advocate vindicated. Dublin: John Mullany, 1, Parliament Street.
7. *Pastoral Address of the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops to the Catholic Clergy and People of Ireland.* Dublin: James Duffy, 7, Wellington Quay.
8. *Rules and Regulations of the Commissioners of National Education.* Dublin: Alex. Thom and Sons, 87, Abbey Street.
9. *A Digest of the Evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Lords appointed to enquire into the working of the National System of Education in Ireland.* By the Rev. W.

- le Poer Trench, D. D. Dublin : W. Curry, 9, Upper Sackville Street.
10. *Education the work of the People.* A Letter to Lord John Russell. By W. J. Unwin, M. A., Principal of Homerton College. London: Ward and Co., 27, Paternoster Row.
11. *The Advantages of the Secular System.* By a Clergyman of the diocese of Meath. Dublin : McGlashan and Gill.
12. *State Rationalism in Education.* By the Rev. Henry Formby. Dublin : J. Duffy, Wellington Quay.
13. *Lectures on National Education.—Has the Church or the State the power to Educate the Nation?* By the Rev. F. D. Maurice. London : Rivington, and Darton and Clark, Holborn Hill.

THE great question of modern times is confessedly that of education. Both in Catholic and in Protestant countries, it is a battle-field, every inch of which has been hotly disputed by contending powers. Everywhere the State has, at one time or other, endeavoured to take this matter into its own hands ; urged forward, in some instances, by an undue desire to enlarge its influence, in others by a loyal desire to discharge its duties and enlighten its people. We are perhaps too apt, owing to the lessons taught by the experience of recent times, to forget that not very many years ago, the most large-minded statesman, one with no erastian leanings, and no desire to extend the civil sceptre over that region which belongs, in at least as large a measure to the Church, and to the family, as to the State, might easily have gone beyond his limit in this matter. No one had a deeper conviction than Wordsworth, the poet, that it is from the root of spiritual things that everything noble and honorable in a nation grows up ; yet in his great poem, "the Excursion," he sighs for those golden days when the State shall recognise her high mission, "Binding herself by Statute" to bestow upon each of her children the instruction he needs. Doubtless, however, the problem on the solution of which he felt that so much depended was not that of the State versus the Church, but the State versus a huge undigested mass of ignorance and barbarism. Few deep thinkers would now commit themselves to the approval of such schemes of State education, nay, of compulsory education, as Prussia at one time adopted, and at last found it necessary to discard, in

favour of one founded more on the solid basis of religion and liberty.

On this, as on other subjects, the nineteenth century has been a period of intellectual growth. Theories which, even when they combated the materialism of the eighteenth century, were yet themselves but a finer growth out of that rank deposit, have given place to principles more philosophical. In the earlier part of this century, State Education was asserted with a cynical nakedness. A man who was great enough to overcome all dangers except those which were occasioned by his own unbridled self-will, has left on record the briefest and most distinct confutation of the system which he had himself established, simply by explaining his motives. It is thus that Napoleon the First describes his educational system, "Mon but principal dans l'établissement d'un corps enseignant est d'avoir un moyen *de diriger les opinions politiques et morales* (Dictionnaire Napoleon, p. 177). An attempt more fatal to the virtue, the religion, the moral being, and ultimately, to the political well-being of a nation could not be described in so few words. It was probably from less enterprising motives—from the love of centralization, and from jealousy of ecclesiastical influence—that Louis Philippe, during the whole of his reign, waged a barren war against that religious education which alone could have expelled the virus of infidelity left behind by the first French Revolution. He triumphed, and, to his ruin, nothing contributed more than that triumph. No solid foundation for a permanent order of things had been laid; and a rising in the metropolis was sufficient to upset the most wary but not the wisest, of European monarchs. But the warning had not been thrown away. The Republic, under the Presidentship of the present Emperor, conceded the great question of freedom in education, for which M. de Montalembert had so long contended, as he restored to the Church its synodical functions; and a religious education has been the result. It was time for sovereigns to unbind the only power that could sustain order, and to discard the policy of the Irishman who sawed off the branch on which he was sitting. The "derniere analyse" of education dissociated from faith, is well illustrated in the following passage of a *Letter to the Right Hon. S. H. Walpole, M. P.*, by J. C. Colquhoun, Esq.—"In the broad glare of

the revolutionary history of 1848, in that chaos of confusion, delusion, and dreams, where socialist raved, and the infidel and mob plundered, the leaders were the school-masters, and their scholars the masses." Education must ever be one of the greatest dangers to a nation, if it be not one of the greatest benefits. Long since Edmund Burke defined Jacobinism to be the insurrection of the talents of a country against its property.

Among our own statesmen the advance has been in the same direction. Few English statesmen would now undertake what the purest patriotism and philanthropy might have induced them to attempt in the beginning of the century. The progress made on this subject is curiously illustrated by the great debate on Education in June, 1839. The measure introduced by the liberal government of that day was by no means of an extreme character. The government distinctly stated that what they objected to was only the claim of the Established Church to educate the children of dissenting Bodies. "My opinion," said one of their chiefs, "is, that the education of the children of the church should be given to the church; and let any man in this house, or elsewhere, oppose that principle, and I will be the man to support it." And yet their measure was most vigorously opposed. A noble lord who led that opposition went straight to the middle ages for his principles, and quoted from the laws of Henry the Fourth's time, which affirmed that "*La doctrine et information des enfans est chose spirituelle.*" Clearly and strongly he asserted that religion is the soul of education, and that the ministers of religion should therefore have the chief part in it. "Religion, then, is not a thing apart from education, but is interwoven with its whole system, and is a principle which controls and regulates the whole mind and happiness of the people." (Mirror of Parliament for 1839.) Who was the man to lift up this religious banner? The Earl of Derby—the same individual who some eight years previously had introduced the system of national education into Ireland. That system, though it had made considerable provision for religion, was far from coming up to the elevated standard of Lord Derby's opinions in 1839. Many of the other speeches delivered on this occasion evince a similar progress, especially those of Sir Robert Peel, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Gladstone. It is true that there were

circumstances which made a considerable difference between the case of Irish and English education ; but this alone will not account for the changed tone of public men. The minds of statesmen had not remained stationary while the mind of all Europe had been making progress. That progress has been continued to our own day. In every country, but pre-eminently in conservative Austria, where the emperor has lately given entire educational freedom to his Protestant subjects—thus extending to them, as he had promised, that liberty which in his Concordat he bestowed upon the Catholic Church—has the State been renouncing, at once to its honour and for its signal benefit, exaggerated pretensions. After a protracted struggle the principles of liberty and of religion have made their ground good in England, and in nearly every English dependency. Those principles are not, we believe, necessarily limited to any one particular system ; but they have already given us thoroughly Catholic Schools, supported by public funds, in our North American Colonies, in Malta, and in Australia. We have also the chartered and endowed Catholic Universities of Sydney and of Quebec. In several of the Australian Colonies, and several of the West Indian Islands, the Mixed System has quite recently been found a failure, (as it generally will where not most carefully conducted ;) and the Denominational one is, as we hear, every day superseding it.

What part is Ireland to take in this matter ? Is she to share the general progress ? To discuss that question would be premature until we hear more respecting the answer given by the government to the demand of the bishops. So far as report goes, the expressions used by the government are understood to include a promise to return to the original principles on which the national system was founded. In pointing out what those principles were, how far the present system has drifted from them, and how much would be implied by an engagement to return to them, we shall be contributing to the cause of peace, and no less, so far as our present information permits us, to that of sound Catholic education. A later period will be more suitable for the discussion of abstract principles. We have our own bias on that subject, and shall not endeavour to conceal it ; but on the other hand, we fully admit that the deepest principles may be modified in their application, according to the exigency of circum-

stances, and that there may often exist an honorable and expedient as well as a dishonorable and dangerous compromise. Ireland must remember that the less influence she allows to the State in education, the less assistance she must be prepared to receive. If she demands complete educational liberty she demands "a great work." This is not by necessity any disadvantage; on the contrary, the noblest and most fruitful lesson a nation can learn is that of self-dependence; and no education is sound which does not tend to teach this lesson. In England the State claims little authority in education. It recognizes the principle that the function of the State is to *promote* education, and, so far as its secular element is concerned, to *direct* it, but by no means, itself, to *educate*. It knows that for the State to be a nation's educator is a pretension as extreme as if it were to set itself up as a nation's chief minstrel or philosopher. It knows that, religiously considered, such a system belongs essentially to pagan times, when the gods were national, and creeds of no moment; when the State was itself the church, worship one of its functions, and the "mother city," with its templed acropolis, the only Sion. It knows that all this has been changed by a Christian order of things, which brings us into contact with supernatural Truths as certain, and to Faith as definite, as the phenomena of outward nature,—Truths essential to salvation, and yet for the discernment of which the State cannot believe itself invested with any special faculty. It knows that Christianity has also changed this order of things by its exaltation of the Family, a thing too great to be servile to the State in spiritual relations, and which ever finds the true vindicator of its liberty in the Church, itself the family of God, and the household of faith. The State claims, therefore, little authority in England; but, on the other hand, it gives comparatively little aid; and yet even that measure of assistance is condemned by the "voluntary" school, as deeply injurious to individual exertion, and to a high estimate of education. We shall confine ourselves for the present to a humbler department of this great subject. Whether Ireland is, or is not, to make progress as to the character of her education, depends on the degree in which she is prepared to make sacrifices, and the degree in which those sacrifices, as ennobling as arduous, may be forced upon her. Our present theme is that, at all events,



Ireland ought not to retrograde in educational principles, and that she is in danger of doing so.

Before entering upon this subject we must protest in the strongest terms against the tendency which in some quarters has been shown, to give to the discussion not only a party character, but a character of the most exasperated violence. It is hardly worth while to notice the excesses of isolated individuals at either side; but the general tone of the English press, with reference to the recent movement in Ireland, has been that of the coarsest abuse, and most unwarrantable imputation of motives. A Pastoral, solemnly issued by the whole Hierarchy of Ireland assembled in synod, and treating with gravity and dignity a most momentous subject, and one respecting which the clergy are confessedly called on to interest themselves, has been treated almost as if it had been a treasonable manifesto. This is extremely stupid; for no one can imagine that a Hierarchy which has stood the storms of fourteen centuries is likely to be intimidated by newspaper blustering, or that the devotion so long felt to it by a faithful people, and cemented by so many a fiery trial, can be otherwise than increased by undeserved insults. The Irish are not such fools as to discard their proved friends in a vain endeavour to propitiate enemies whom servility can only render more unreasoning and oppressive. Plain facts are the best answer to fiction. The bishops have been accused of a desire to suppress education. But their words are as strong as words can be in the opposite sense. They say, "We have not been without knowing that in a country such as ours, where the educated man, from the lowest to the highest, is sure to leave all others far behind him on the road to wealth or distinction; where the son of the humblest man in the community may, by his intellectual superiority, rise to the highest office attainable by a subject; and where the artizan, with only the hands and the head that God gave him, may realize a fortune and win fame—we have not been without knowing that in such a country the people must be educated; and we may appeal to our Catholic schools, colleges, and our Catholic university, erected out of very scanty resources, as evidence of the sincerity of our desire for the diffusion of sound and useful education." They have next been accused of a tyrannical desire to get into their own hands all the educational institutes of the country. But it is

self-evident that the system for which they have avowed a preference is, on the contrary, one which would prevent the possibility of such a tyranny, since its fundamental principle is that each denomination is to have the charge of its own affairs. They have, in the third place, been accused of a desire to exclude the State from all influence in education. Has the State then no influence in those English schools which it inspects, and in which salaries and other pecuniary advantages are awarded exclusively according to the reports of its inspectors? Again and again the strongest advocates of the denominational system have expressed their conviction that the secular part of education belongs mainly to the State; that very great advantage results from State interference in this matter, and that the clergy are responsible only for the religious department of education. We rejoice to be able to believe that whatever have been the extravagances of a large portion of the press on this subject, the more thoughtful statesmen of England are not disposed to countenance them. They do not think that principles for which in England Dissenters have contended, as well as members of the Established Church, and laymen, if possible, with more enthusiasm than clergymen, can be recommended to Catholic bishops in Ireland only by a selfish love of power or by foreign sympathies. It was reserved for a Catholic, on a recent occasion at Cork, to bring some such charge against the prelates of his own Church in the presence of statesmen and courtiers, who may have heard it with pleasure, but hardly with respect for the speaker, and certainly with surprise. If the report of the speech to which we allude was incorrect, we trust that it has been long since disavowed. If it be avowed the Queen's colleges have suffered a wound severer than any other argument could have inflicted. A significant illustration has been exhibited of their influence on a Catholic mind.

Before quitting this part of our subject we shall quote from a Protestant sermon a passage, the eloquence of which cannot fail to delight our readers; while our Protestant friends, when they contrast the enthusiasm which doubtless greeted it, with the vituperation poured forth upon Catholic prelates, whose language has been of a far more moderate character, will not fail to be reminded of a certain old adage about the man who steals the horse, and the man who looks over the hedge. Our extract does not

relate to the Established Church of England. That Church boasts "a little sister at home," originally planted in this country for missionary purposes yet unfulfilled. In setting forth her claims High Church enthusiasm generally grows constrained, for she is commonly regarded as a standing confutation of High Church principles. The following passage is from a sermon preached in favour of the Irish "Church Education Society," by the late lamented William Archer Butler, well known both as a poet and as a learned and eloquent professor. In its special application, the light which it sheds is doubtless that of the

"Eye that gildeth all on which it gazeth ;"

but we think that no Catholic can read it without fancying for it a different application, and resolving that his Church shall at least never be the mere drudge of a State that does not pretend to respect her.

"For this purpose it was, as we affirm, that Christ Himself appointed a successive ministry, and that the apostles under His guidance began the permanent location of that ministry in the various districts of the converted world : that is, began the Diocesan and Parochial system which we inherit. We farther maintain, that from the nature and objects of such a body, it plainly shows that their authority of Spiritual Superintendence extends equally over every period of life ; the obligation becoming only more urgent in proportion to the importance of the period on the general formation of the moral character. The circumstances of its fulfilment may vary, the principle of the obligation is unchangeable : and whether in the pulpit, the sick room, the cottage, parlour, or the school, the minister of Christ is equally doing what he cannot, without a crime, neglect, what no man, without a crime, can hinder his doing. The direction of moral education is as much involved in the ministerial commission, as the office of preaching ; and in point of fact, the minister of Christ is not more impressively warned to *preach* the truth in public exposition than he is to *teach* it in every other practicable form.

"Yes, the Church, for in this, as I began so must I end my argument—the Church is the fitting educator of the people. From that hour of feebleness, when she receives the infant at the font, and blesses it in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to that hour of as helpless feebleness, when she feeds the parting spirit with the Bread of Life, and the promise of immortality—from the first to the last hour of human existence—the Church is the instructor, the consoler, the friend of her people.

"Her right is derived from a source beyond earth, it cannot without a crime be surrendered. Her commission is from the skies ; it cannot be superseded by the self-constituted emissaries of self-constituted associations. *We* are the ordained and entrusted teachers of the people ; the charter is from Christ, and through Christ from the throne of God. Schemes of instruction, projects of enlightenment, arise and flourish and die ; alone immortal and impassable, the Church of Christ has lived a life of centuries ; and shows no symptoms of decrepitude yet. The corruptions of her earthly scene (for she is yet but militant) have often darkened her with their gloomiest shadow, but no earthly power shall ever pierce a vital part. The body of Christ is immortal as its immortal Head ! And if you would know what is the essence of all legitimate 'National Education' in the eye of Him who is the Lord of Nations, read it in the promise in which, commissioning her to be the instructress of the people, Christ, ere he passed to heaven, breathed into her frame the breath of imperishable life, 'Go ye and teach all nations.....and lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world.'"

We shall not endeavour to emulate this spirit-stirring appeal. Our present theme is humbler. It is not the denominational system, versus the "mixed," but the "mixed" system, as it now stands, versus that which was originally introduced in 1831. For the statesmen who introduced that system we entertain the highest respect. Several of them during a long series of years had fought, side by side with us, the great battle of Catholic Emancipation, and had made political sacrifices for it, although to others was accidentally awarded the glory of carrying that great measure. The opponents of that system were the opponents of everything liberal or just that had been done in Ireland. Possibly no measure founded on more perfect principles could then have been carried. Although not without drawbacks, that system has during more than a quarter of a century conferred many great benefits on Ireland. It was chiefly opposed during its earlier period by those who wished to subvert the Catholic Faith : in many places it has actually assisted the poor in resisting proselytism, although, like the fountain of old which kindled an unlighted torch, but extinguished a lighted one, its tendency in other places may have been of an opposite character. We are grateful to those who planned it ; and we trust that the present Government will not deprive itself of a like tribute of gratitude, by rejecting their example and sustaining proved abuses in preference to

the measure of 1831. As regards the Board also our desire is to say nothing that can be painful to any of its members or ex-members. Lest we should be betrayed into doing so unwittingly we begin by stating expressly that to none of them do we impute any unworthy motive or conscious desire to make the system swerve from that impartiality which it at first maintained, and still professes. We attribute to none of them more than that unconscious bias from which no one with much self-knowledge can believe himself wholly exempt, and to which public Boards are sometimes more subject than individuals. There have been Catholics as well as Protestants at the Board; and as several of them appear not to have perceived what was likely to be the joint effect of changes made at various successive times, it would be unreasonable to expect a keener insight, relatively to Catholic interests, on the part of their coadjutors. The system from the time it came into practical operation included, unfortunately, two sources of danger. In its constitution there was a predominance of that influence which is represented by the State: and in its administration there was a predominance, both official and intellectual, of Protestant influence; Protestants far outnumbering Catholics at the Board and in the chief departments, and being almost exclusively charged with the composition of the school books.\* The line in which the system has moved is a diagonal between these two forces, neither of which is favourable to Catholicism. The development in favour of non-vested schools was, so far a diminution of State influence; but in the south it did us, religiously, no good, though it may have injured other Persuasions, and in the north it did us very grievous harm. The Model schools, on the other hand, do not necessarily expose us to any direct danger of proselytism; but they are the most exaggerated form in which the State can come forward as an educator; and they are consequently injurious to all religious influences, whether Catholic or Protestant.

No statement can be more untrue than the assertion that the Catholic prelates are now for the first time awake to the changed character of the National system. Again and

---

\* This circumstance, though unfortunate, is not to be attributed to any unfair intention. On the contrary a Catholic was originally directed to compose several of the books.

again they have protested. The protest was now that of an individual prelate, now that of a provincial synod, and now that of a national synod; but, with a few trivial exceptions, those protests have been always in vain. Particular cases of abuse have been set straight; but the system has pursued the tenour of its way notwithstanding, impelled by that iron logic against which individuals may rebel, but which institutes and communities slowly but surely obey. Chapter xvi. in the "Catholic Case Stated," gives an unanswerable historic narrative of the efforts made by the Catholic prelates, and their ill success. Several of the present rules were indeed condemned by anticipation in the "Resolutions of the Four Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, passed at their meeting in 1826," when a plan of education, under the auspices of Government, was submitted to them. These resolutions were passed before Catholic Emancipation had been carried, and, nevertheless, the note which they sound is clear and bold. The principle of "mixed education" the prelates by no means approve as such, but the practice may, they say, "*under existing circumstances*, be allowed, provided sufficient care be taken to protect the religion of the Roman Catholic children, and to furnish them with adequate means of religious instruction." (Catholic Case Stated, p. 407.)

To ensure these conditions they proceed to require

"That where Catholic pupils are a majority the head teacher shall be a Catholic, where a minority, that there should be a Catholic assistant; that the Catholic Bishop of the diocese should have either the nomination, or else the express approval of Catholic teachers, who should be removed upon his representation. The Resolutions affirm that there should be separate training schools for Catholic teachers, the staff in which should be exclusively Catholic; that all the religious books to be used in schools should be either selected or approved by the Bishops, and that they should have power to exclude from use in the schools all books of a secular kind to which they might object on religious grounds. On passing these important Resolutions in 1826, the Catholic clergy rapidly withdrew from connection with the Kildare Place Society, and the active and general opposition thus stimulated soon overthrew that body." (Ibid. p. 370.)

In the year 1840, the Catholic Hierarchy having long been divided on the subject of national education, a committee consisting of three prelates favourable to that



system, and three unfavourable, was appointed for the purpose of suggesting an arrangement calculated to produce unanimity. After much discussion the primate, Dr. Crolly, drew up six resolutions, which were unanimously adopted by the prelates and submitted to the Lord Lieutenant. These Resolutions re-affirmed most of the principles asserted in 1826, and made several suggestions besides, in harmony with them. The Lord Lieutenant refused every one of these requests without exception—the Presbyterian body having only a month previously “obtained the removal of the main objection which had prevented them from joining the national system.”

In 1847 the bishops passed a resolution condemning a recent change by which the Board required that all schools to the building of which they had contributed should be vested in them. This resolution produced no effect; but in the next month “Archdeacon Stopford submitted to the National Board his application for aid to his schools in Kells, and in November, 1847, the order of the Board was passed, which removed the last remaining of Lord Stanley’s defences against proselytism in national schools.” (p. 276.) In 1850 the Synod of Thurles was held. The Queen’s Colleges had specially attracted attention to the importance of sound principles in education. As to the National system, the Synod, while it declared that “the separate education of Catholic youth is in every way to be preferred to it,” made suggestions for the purpose of rendering that system “as little dangerous as possible,” especially adverting to the advice given by the Papal Rescript of 1841. The resolutions of the Synod again re-affirmed the leading principles of 1826, adding other suggestions suited to the time; especially objecting to the recent rule of the Board respecting the conditions on which it gives aid to the building of schools; and forbidding Catholic schoolmasters, while in training schools, to attend lectures on history given by a Protestant professor. We know not what answer the government vouchsafed to that Synod, unless the “Ecclesiastical Titles’ Bill” was that answer. In 1856, a pastoral issued by the entire Hierarchy to the Catholics of Ireland, condemned the prohibition of the sign of the cross in the Catholic national schools. That pastoral, and another one published in 1857, re-affirmed the principle that a separate education for Catholics is to be *preferred* to a mixed education,

especially as that term is now understood. In the latter year the last Catholic prelate connected with the Board left his seat there. The protests of individual prelates, especially against model schools, from the time that their character became clearly understood, have been numerous. The most important of them was that of the Archbishop of Dublin, in 1851. The letter of his Grace to Alderman Boylan points out the practical identity of the system pursued in the model schools and that of the Queen's Colleges, and traces the gradual deviations from the original principle of the National system. In August 1858, the prelates of the province of Tuam, with their Archbishop at their head, published a pastoral protesting against the erection of a model school in Sligo.

Such have been the successive and vain efforts of the Catholic prelates to keep the system as clear as possible from abuses, a system which they had never, as a Body, cordially approved of, but which they had agreed, with the exception of the Archbishop of Tuam, to try as an experiment. They were encouraged to this course by the Papal Rescript of 1841. That Rescript, after adverting to various circumstances of the time, which rendered any decision respecting the *principle* of "mixed education" a difficult thing, stated that the Holy See had "resolved that no judgment should be *definitely pronounced in this matter*, and that this kind of education should be left to the prudent discretion and religious conscience of *each individual bishop*, whereas its success must depend on the vigilant care of the pastors, on the various *cautions to be adopted, and on the future experience which time will supply*." Among the cautions alluded to above are these—that all books containing aught injurious to Catholicity should be removed from the schools; that Catholic preceptors only should "give religious, moral, or historical lectures to the Catholic schoolmasters in the model school;" that "it is much safer that literary instruction only should be given in mixed schools, than that the fundamental articles, as they are called, and the articles in which all Christians agree, should be taught there in common;" and that "it would be very useful that the school-houses should be vested exclusively in the bishops or the parish priests." Furthermore, a significant recommendation is added, viz., that it is also their (the bishop's) duty *strenuously to endeavour to obtain from the Government*

*by degrees, a better order of things and more equitable conditions."* Such was the Rescript which has been represented as a complete and cordial approval by Rome of the National system. It put an end to the public controversies on the subject which had previously divided the Episcopate. The bishops have endeavoured, but in vain, to carry out the cautions suggested in that Rescript. Should they finally fail in this attempt, what can remain for them but to act yet more strenuously than at an earlier period on the recommendation which that document includes?

The above brief retrospect is a comment necessary for the understanding of the recent Pastoral. To interpret the text by the context, is the course generally prescribed by good sense, and by candour. We have furnished the context. "The Mixed System" is an expression with two very different meanings. Sometimes it is used in the abstract, and denotes only a system in which children belonging to different religious denominations, are educated in the same schools. The second, and more ordinary meaning of the formula, is the concrete one of the system such as we have it. In the latter sense, the system has been condemned as decidedly dangerous. The two meanings of the expression are distinctly recognised in the words "mixed education, whether as such, or as in actual operation." Even in the former sense, the system has been spoken of in severer terms than it has before been, owing, no doubt, to the abuses which, as experience has proved, it so easily generates, and retains with such tenacity. A decided preference for the separate system has been also pronounced; nay, it is clearly stated that certain principles which "*should*" be carried out in Catholic schools, can be "*adequately*" carried out in that system alone. These are the strongest expressions in the Pastoral. That it disapproves "mixed education," even in the abstract, and on principle, is certain; and that it declares war against that system, *as it now exists*, is clear also. It does not follow from this by necessity, that the "mixed system" if brought back to its original principles, would be rejected, though it is plain that a system based on sounder principles would be preferred. Reforms have not, it is true, been again demanded; but to reiterate demands again and again contumeliously rejected, is not a course generally considered either dignified or expedient. The Pastoral

assumes that reform has been finally refused; and that the system has to be maintained *as it stands*, or else to be discarded. The Hierarchy, accordingly, turns its face to the east, and points to that principle which alone it regards as thoroughly sound and finally safe, and in which it desires ultimately to rest. This is obviously not conclusive as to the immediate question; for a great principle is a star by which we steer, without reaching it; and the final port is a very different thing from the sea-voyage thither. At all events, writing as we do without authority, we may abstain from determining on a doubtful point. Labouring in the cause of peace, and assuming that all Catholics agree that no education is fit for their children which imperils their faith, we think we shall place beyond doubt the fact that their faith can only be protected either by the separate system, or else by such a searching reform of the present system as will prevent the recurrence of its abuses. We have a people, and we have a cause. When these are united the result is not doubtful, on the long run. Between the alternatives we have named, the State will have to make its choice. There is no reason why, by throwing itself upon an extreme course, it should render peace impossible.

It can be hardly necessary to advert at length to an argument sometimes urged against any demand for reform in education. We allude to the rhetorical assertion that to reject what has once been accepted is a breach of faith. It would not be easy to point to any engagement by which ecclesiastical authorities, at either side, had bound themselves to abide by whatever they had once agreed to try. It was expressly as an "experiment" that some important parts of the national system were adopted; and experience only could determine what their effect would be. It seems somewhat whimsical that this plea for stability should be urged by those who have themselves introduced the changes complained of. It was urged some years ago, but of course in vain, as a means of protecting two books which it was found necessary to withdraw from the list sanctioned by the Board. The character of the National system was determined without even an act of parliament. An act of parliament itself pretends to no "finality," and the person who introduces it, has an equal right to propose its repeal, provided always that care be taken to protect any interests that may be thus compromised. In such a

matter as education, we need hardly observe that nothing could be more immoral than for the clergy of any religious denomination to connect themselves with the State at all, if they were, in so doing, to contract an engagement superseding their first duty, that of providing for the religious welfare of the flocks committed to their charge. The argument of "consistency" was used in England some twenty years ago. The following passage, taken from a magazine edited by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, will shew that it was regarded by that accomplished and most remarkable writer as indicating rather the urgent need of reform, than the impropriety of seeking reform.

"For though the Committee of the Council may not be aware that men who have once acknowledged a power about the legitimacy of which they have long been doubtful, afterwards, for their own credit's sake, and the ease of their consciences, are eager to justify encroachments which at first they would have thought intolerable, rather than to recognise the truth of warnings which they despised; though the supporters of the Committee may not know that this has been the history of every tyranny which has been in the world—its chances of ultimate success great, in proportion as its beginnings were slender, and its demands plausible—so very obvious an inference from the records of the past, cannot easily escape those who are watching their proceedings; not suspiciously, from hatred of them, but jealously, from love to their country. And therefore, such persons must lift up their voices and say, 'Once admit State control into education, and let those who propose it be as honest as they may; let the agents they select be the least offensive possible; yet you have given up a ground which you must, if possible, recover, but which, we fear, you will have cause to your latest day, to repent that you ever abandoned.' We know that the utterance of such words, still more the frequent repetition of them, must be tormenting to some, tiresome to others; that one will accuse us of party spirit; another, of over-caution, a third, of a determination to hinder, by all means, the spread of education in the land. If we are not prepared for such charges, if our principle is not sufficiently stable to bear us up under them, we are unfit to live in this day: perfectly incapable of doing any good in it."\*

There are some who deny that the National system is materially changed. This is a matter of *fact*. It is in a work which gives a complete resumé of that system, both as regards its history and its present workings, that we may

---

\* Educational Magazine. May 1840, p. 332.

expect to find that information necessary to enable us to ascertain how the fact stands. Such a work has been published under the title of "The Catholic Case Stated." It has been met hitherto chiefly by recriminations accusing the author of inconsistency, and suggesting various unworthy motives under which he may be supposed to have written his work. Into this war of personalities we shall of course not enter. We have prefixed to this article the names of such replies or attempted replies to the "Catholic Case" as we have seen, and also Mr. Kavanagh's reply to them. We are not surprised that the celebrated book in question should have called forth personalities, for we regret to say that it contains a great deal of the same sort: what however does surprise us is, that it should have encountered so little else—so little that even pretends to be an answer to its statements. Attacks on an author's character are relevant chiefly when it is as a witness that he comes forward. It is not in this capacity that we have to deal with him. Apart, however, from his individual opinions, and from evidence not demonstrated, to which we shall seldom allude, Mr. Kavanagh's book has collected together such an amount of information that we shall consult the convenience of our readers in making our quotations largely from it when referring to facts, rules, official documents, statistics, parliamentary returns, &c. Our readers will thus find it more easy to refer to our quotations, and to verify them by appeal to original sources. When therefore, no other book is mentioned, it is to his that our references are made. Any one, however, who possesses a copy of Archdeacon Stopford's\* Report on the Schools of the Diocese of Meath, (1844) will find a history, not less able and detailed, of all the chief changes which had taken place in the National system up to the date of that pamphlet. Had we seen it earlier we should have quoted from it more largely than we can now do. The Archdeacon affirms repeatedly, and clearly proves, that even previous to the changes which he desired when he wrote, and which have since taken place, the alterations already made were, not only numerous, but *essential* and *fundamental*, absolutely reversing the principles, in several instances, upon which the system had been introduced.

---

\* Grant, Milliken, and Bolton, Dublin 1844.



He proves also that all the changes were made in the Protestant interest. No greater benefit could be done to the cause of education than by the re-printing of this Pamphlet, omitting only the charges needlessly brought forward respecting the secrecy of the said changes, and against the probity of the Board.

The alterations in the National system of education may be referred to three classes: 1st, changes as regards its Principles and Rules: 2nd, changes in its essential *character*, produced by the nature of its books, by institutions forming at first no part of it, and by its use of patronage: and 3rd, changes in its actual working, and practical results. Besides these, good sense requires also that a due weight should be attached also to the changes, political and social, which have taken place since the system was first introduced, and the degree in which they tend either to encourage more of trust, or to demand more of prudence on the part of Catholics.

The advantage derived from a complete and simultaneous view of these changes consists chiefly in our being thus enabled to consider them in their *joint* result. Taken separately, they carry with them a less marked significance. One of them is pushed aside as trivial; another was accidental; a third was obviously necessary; a fourth was conceded by all parties. It is when we stand upon a height that we see what has been the general course of a river, not when following its curves. It is the tendency of every institute to extend its influence, consolidate its power, and multiply its ministrations. This is its instinct: it results often from a zeal on the part of its members without which it could not have worked efficiently. All that we require is that men whose good intentions we do not contest should prove them by correcting, when indicated, the abuses which they failed to prevent.

One of those changes involved dangers not originally foreseen; viz. the introduction of religious teaching at the hours of combined instruction. It is one of two alterations early made, and of such importance as to amount to a change of principle. The original principle, as laid down by Mr. Stanley in 1831, was

“That the schools be kept open for a certain number of hours on four or five days of the week, for *moral* and *literary* instruction

only; and that the remaining one or two days in the week be set apart for giving *separately*, such *religious* education to the children, as may be approved of by the clergy of their respective persuasions. The commissioners will also permit and encourage the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their respective persuasions either before or after the ordinary school hours on the other days of the week.\*

The system, as originally set forth, was announced by Mr. Stanley as one "from which should be banished even the suspicion of proselytism." Such it might have continued but for that afterthought, the ill-considered though doubtless well-intended introduction of religion into the *combined* portion of instruction. Too great proximity produces collisions. Had the religious part of the education continued separate, half the bickerings which have since arisen might have been avoided, and an efficient religious education might have been carried out. But in snatching at the shadow, the substance was dropped. A *principle* can never be given up without grave loss. A definite line had previously been laid down between that portion of the education which was to be combined, and that portion which, by an unfortunate necessity, must remain separate. That line once obliterated, religious instruction became a species of border warfare contested on the "debatable ground" of theology without definite doctrine. The Scripture Extracts which originated from this attempt, were met by a storm of indignation at the Protestant side; while, if they had never been heard of, the whole of the Protestant Bible might have been taught to Protestants during adequate and ample hours of separate instruction, and the Douay Testament might have been read to Catholics, or by them. The innovation was proposed by the Rev. Mr. Carlisle who, on one occasion, vindicated it as an "experiment" toward "introducing *scriptural light* among the population generally." He probably did not know that the Douay Testament was one of many religious books which Dr. Doyle had long since required to be provided in all his schools. No one would think of teaching religion to children in the form of scholastic definitions, but to be taught effectually, it must be taught in the spirit of freedom, not with the enfeebling constraint that belongs to compromise. Charity is a

---

\* Catholic Case Stated, p. 19.

thing that lies far deeper than mere concession ; and as for *mutual* concession, as regards Catholic and Protestant teaching, the thing cannot exist. If there is to be a *common* religious teaching the whole of the concessions must come from Catholicism, because it holds whatever of positive doctrine is retained by Protestants, with the addition of a great deal to which they object. But as the Catholic believes that the doctrines denied by Protestants are involved in the doctrines which they have retained, it follows that if he undertakes to teach the latter to Protestant children, it is not really in a merely Protestant sense that he can do so. That God "became man" is with him a statement identical with the proposition that Mary is "the Mother of God." The latter he is not allowed to teach to Protestant children : and yet at the end of each lesson in the Scripture Extracts is a series of questions ; and the theory of this form of instruction is that knowledge is to be first "questioned into children and then questioned out of them"! It does not seem strange that zealous Protestants should have disapproved of this mode of instruction, and that Catholics who are no less at the mercy of Protestant teachers, should be discontented at finding that these Scripture Extracts were taught in 1853, either habitually or occasionally, in 42 per cent of all the national schools, the majority of teachers in those particular schools being Protestants. (p. 35.) Still more of contention and mutual distrust has been occasioned by others of the works introduced to further a combined religious education. The simplest mode of preventing such contention in future seems to us that of cutting off their original source. Whether any engagements have been contracted which render such a remedy impracticable we leave others to decide. Where deviations from the original System, of a character hostile to Catholics, have been ratified by irrevocable engagements, Catholics have an obvious right to some *equivalent* advantage, by way of compensation.

As the change from the original principle of a separate religious education, came from the Protestant side, so did another change of the same sort. It is early referred to in Mr. Kavanagh's book.

"Lord Stanley's letter contained, among other things, permission 'to supply the schools with works of separate religious

instruction at prime cost.' But the Protestant Commissioners, at the first regular meeting of the Board, (1st Dec. 1831) declined to agree to supply such books to Catholics. Connected with this, it was proposed to circulate, at prime cost, and for *separate* religious instruction, both versions of the New Testament, to which proposal the two Catholic Commissioners agreed. The Protestant members again dissented, unless the *notes* were omitted from the Douay Testament. Rev. Mr. Carlisle then proposed that they should ask *permission* from the government *not to require them to exclude* from the several books which they had got permission to edit 'such portions of Sacred History, or of religious or moral teaching as may be approved by the Board.' After much discussion, his proposition was assented to, with little expectation of its practical success, and with the condition that the entire Board should be unanimous in approving of any such matter as might be introduced. This *permission not to exclude* such new element from combined or common instruction was granted by Lord Stanley, and a sentence to that effect was added to the original draft of his letter, which *amended* copy was first published by the Board in 1842."

The alteration thus made was a further compromise between the principle of a *separate* religious education, and that of a *combined* religious education, and it united the difficulties of both principles without realizing the benefits of either. It belongs to the ordinary *mechanical* view of religion as a thing not only including *distinguishable* parts but parts capable of being separated or reunited at will, like the sticks in a fagot; and for this reason, even more than from its liability to abuse, it was repugnant to Catholic sympathies.

We shall now refer to another great change of Principle, by which the later changes in the Rules have been largely occasioned. Not only in all communities that claim the name of churches, but even in the most transient sects, the clergy exercise an admitted influence over the education of their respective flocks, and especially over that of the poor. Their guidance is claimed on the ground of religious expediency, quite irrespectively of ecclesiastical authority. The necessity for it is obvious. Every conscientious parent wishes his children to be brought up in the religion which he himself believes to be true. But how is the peasant to ascertain what schools are to be trusted in this matter, and what are to be shunned as dangerous? What can he know about books he has never read, or of a Board

---

\* Catholic Case Stated, p. 21.

of which he could not explain a single function? Can he always detect erroneous teaching, even in its graver forms; and is it not notorious that it is, in its more latent forms, that error is most dangerous? Supposing him capable of deciding on what is objectionable in a *positive* sense, can he judge of what is negatively dangerous? Can he decide whether the *omission* of this or that portion of religious instruction, or devout observance, is likely to prove a snare? This is a matter which changes with the various changes in the social and political atmosphere by which he is affected; to master it the poor man must know a good deal of ethical philosophy, as well as of history and theology, and hardly needs a pastor. But if he requires advice, from whom is he to receive it? From the newspapers? They may be written by infidels. From his landlord? he may be an excellent man, but his very charities may be stimulated by his religious predilections. From the State? But what if he be a Dissenter;—or what if he be a Roman Catholic, and with all due respect for the State, thinks, notwithstanding, that a Nation which affects to rule its own Spiritual Teaching, and Believing, by its own authority, is as foolish as a man who claimed the like despotic authority over his own watch, setting its hands according to his caprice, without reference to any rule so rigid or external as that of the parish clock or the sun, and changing them to suit his convenience? The peasant's natural adviser is evidently the religious community to which he belongs; of this his clergy are the exponents; and by their advice he is guided; not from any absurd notion that every part of instruction must be taught theologically, but because his pastor is the best and most responsible judge as to whether a particular educational course, as a whole, be or be not safe in its religious bearings. These principles are admitted by all alike, except at periods when enthusiasts or politicians aspire to effect some religious change, and labour to bring it about by assuming an antagonism where both God and nature have established a harmony without which society would be a chronic anarchy—a harmony between the parental and the pastoral authority.

To apply this. The National system of education, as originally instituted, *recognized* both pastoral and parental authority, *enforcing* the latter, though not the former. As modified by its recent changes, it recognizes the

parental only, leaving it to enforce itself; while to the pastoral it now assigns no place, in a vast majority of the schools. It puts them in contrast one with the other; and, if it does not directly create an antagonism between them, it tends to do so indirectly, partly by rules which deprive the clergy of privileges originally theirs—rules made at the instance (as we shall shew) of those who denounce their authority as a usurpation—and partly by a habitual defiance of the wishes of the clergy, as regards many important parts of education.

Let us appeal to documents. Mr. Stanley's Letter, published in 1831, by which the National system was inaugurated, bound it by two engagements, the practical identity of which will become the more plain the more we consider them as illustrated by recent experience—the repudiation of Proselytism, and the recognition of Pastoral authority. The first is expressed in these words: "The Commissioners of 1812 recommended the appointment of a Board of *this description*, to superintend a system of education, from which should be banished even the suspicion of proselytism, and which, admitting children of all religious persuasions, should not interfere with the peculiar religious tenets of any." He next proceeds to mention the Kildare-street Society, one cause for the failure of which, he finds in the circumstance that it insisted on the reading of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment.

"It seems to have been overlooked, that the *principles of the Roman Catholic Church* (to which in any system intended for general diffusion throughout Ireland, the bulk of the pupils must necessarily belong,) were totally at variance with *this principle*; and that the indiscriminate reading of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment, by children, must be peculiarly obnoxious to a Church which denies, even to adults, the right of unaided private interpretation of the Sacred Volume with reference to articles of religious belief."—p. 415.

In his next reference to the clergy he states the practical consequences of denying their just rights.

"Shortly after its institution, although the Society prospered, and extended its operations under the fostering care of the Legislature, this *vital defect* began to be noticed, and the Roman Catholic clergy began to exert themselves with energy and success, against a system to which *they were on principle opposed*, and which they feared might lead in its results to proselytism, even although no such object was contemplated by its promoters. When this oppo-



sition arose, founded on such grounds, it soon became manifest that the system could not become one of National Education."—p. 415,

The Roman Catholic clergy are here recognized as men having "principles" and acting on them. In the jargon of a day which may be said, when compared with 1831, nay, with 1812, to have indulged in "reactionary" notions, their opposition is commonly attributed, not to conscientious principles, but to very sordid motives. Here, however, a system which incurs their just and necessary distrust, is said to have a "vital defect" in it, for the reason that their flocks must be supposed to be of one mind with them, so long as both remain Roman Catholics.

Archdeacon Stopford, in his Report of 1844, (p. 12-13) enumerating the changes in the National system which have entitled it to the support of the Protestant clergy, gives a prominent place to the repudiation of that principle of Pastoral right which he speaks of as actually a part of the original charter. He says,

"It appears to have been felt that this *part of their charter* was ill adapted to effect united education. The Board have never *professed* to found their Rules on such a principle. They have in fact skilfully set it aside, and substituted a different principle in its place. About the year 1833, they applied for, and obtained official explanations of Lord Stanley's letter. One object of these explanations was to substitute *Parental for Priestly* authority, as the principle to which concession was to be made."

This change he further illustrates by a comparison of the Rule of 1832 with that of 1833. Naturally, a change which recommends the system to him bears to us a less alluring aspect. Is it wonderful if the Catholics who broke up the earlier system of the Kildare-street Society should be discontented with a system intended to correct its faults, but which has been frequently declared by Protestant clergymen, to lend them far better opportunities of propagating what they imagine to be Scriptural Truth, and what we know to be Protestant Traditions? Would it have been wiser in the Government which introduced the National System of Education to have gone on ignoring the "vital defect" of that which preceded it, and to have stigmatised with opprobrious imputations those who were clearer-sighted than themselves;—or were they wise in correcting that defect? If the latter is the truer judgment, the State will act wisely,

if it corrects *in time*, the defects of the present system. When a system has drifted from its original engagements, the consistent are those who stand by old principles, not those who follow that which fleets, and vindicate change. Under the present system a zealous Protestant clergyman boasts that he can teach to Catholics that doctrine which Luther declared to be the "*articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ*." Let him do so by all means to all Catholics who wish for his ministrations, or even to all who can be induced to believe that the shy Nymph, Truth is to be found no more in her fount of old, but at the bottom of the "souper's" pot. But let him not do so through the system of National Education.

Mr. Stanley proceeds, "They (the Commissioners) will require.....that the remaining one or two days in the week be set apart for *giving separately such religious education* to the children as may be approved of by the *clergy* of their respective persuasions." Will they? No they will not. A change made in the rules after the system had been eight years at work—made in order to propitiate the Presbyterians—deprives Catholic children, in all non-vested schools under Protestant patrons, of any right to religious instruction in those schools, at the hours either of combined or of separate instruction. (p. 276 and 419.) "They will also permit and encourage the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their respective persuasions either before or after the ordinary school hours on the other days of the week." Will they? There are, as we shall find hereafter, about 100,000 Catholic children in schools where any claim to such ministrations may be legally and effectually resisted.\* (p. 419.) "They will require that a register shall be kept in the schools, in which

---

\* The Rev. J. Mac Ivor insists almost as strongly as Archdeacon Stopford on this change, and its immense importance. Writing to induce his brethren to join the National System, he warns them not to "sustain an organised opposition after its real grounds have vanished." The question, he says, is no longer about "schools, respecting which the clergyman was obliged to bind himself in perpetuity, to share the hours of religious instruction with teachers of all other religious denominations, and actually to allow the priest and dissenting minister to enter his schools, along with himself, and teach their special tenets to all who were willing to learn them."—*Proposed Modifications of the Non-Vested System*, p. 51. McGlashan, Dublin, 1850.

shall be entered the attendance or non-attendance of each child on divine worship on Sundays." Here not only the Catholic clergy are duly recognized as such, but Catholic worship also. It is not so now; and the laity are not the gainers. Children are sometimes taught by fables:—those in the national schools should have been taught the old fable about the sheep that were advised to get rid of their shepherds.

In England, during the early part of the battle which the Established church had to fight in defence of religious education, an attempt was occasionally made to raise the cry of "Parents in danger." It was thus replied to in the "*Educational Magazine*," apparently by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, a writer remarkable for the zeal with which he has always maintained the sanctity of the Family.

"But if we dare to hold and proclaim such a doctrine as this, H. C. has a terrible threat in reserve for us. He will proclaim us to the 'fathers of families.' He will tell them that we mean to invade their rights; to substitute priestly for paternal authority. 'Citizens,' he will say, 'your houses are your castles. The Queen cannot enter them; the Queen dare not. But the emissaries of the National Society will. Nay, they will not be content with entering them: they will push their way to your innermost sanctuaries—to the nursery, to the schoolroom—your children's books will be examined; your children's wardrobe will be criticised. The reports of the National Society will tell what progress your boys have made in the 'Arabian Nights', or in 'Robinson Crusoe'; the shape of your daughter's bonnets, the colour of their pelisses, will be subject to an intolerable ecclesiastical dictation.' Now to all this what can we reply? Simply that in all past times, State education has been the great invader of domestic right and privileges, and that ecclesiastical education ceases to be ecclesiastical when it dares to meddle with them."\*

Are Catholic parents benefited or injured by the injury done to ecclesiastical authority? The answer to this question is found in the large system of proselytism to which a fuller notice will be given in its proper place. No doubt on many occasions such attempts were carried on by means of abuses which the commissioners would have disapproved. Their inspectors however do not seem to have been always encouraged to report very freely upon such cases.

"If they find Catholic children, in thousands, as they are,

---

\* Extract from the "*Educational Magazine*," May 1840, edited by the Rev. F. D. Maurice.

receiving the fulness of Protestant religious instruction from Protestant teachers or clergymen, in national schools, they are not to report it, unless they can prove that the Catholic pupils were *compelled* to be present; nor are they to report it to the parents or to the pastors of those children.—They are to wait until the parents who may know nothing of it, complain of the practice.” p. 329.

Examples are given in which the precept to diplomatists, “*surtout point de zèle*” was very stringently asserted. (p. 405.) The conduct of the Board, on such occasions, must of course depend upon its views as to what constitutes or does not constitute proselytism. In p. 158 is found a remarkable judgment upon this subject. The Board had its attention called by the Right Rev. Dr. Denvir, to the state of the Lancasterian Industrial school at Belfast. An investigation was made: it was proved that from 1847 to 1855 the most flagrant violations of the rules of the national system had taken place; that religious instruction was given habitually to Catholic children by Presbyterians: “that clothing was also supplied, but secular and industrial instruction, breakfast, dinner and supper, were denied to those who absented themselves from *religious instruction*, in the morning, illness alone being considered a sufficient apology for absence. The Catholic girls were required to attend on Catholic holidays and were refused permission to go out to hear mass.” The parents of Catholic children having objected to their being obliged to receive Protestant religious instruction, their objection was thus responded to by the committee which superintended the school. “That as the objection to the *joint reading* has been traced to the Roman Catholic priest, the parent averring that she herself did not object, we hereby declare that *we will receive no dictation from such a source.*”\*

\* A very different view of Pastoral influence is frankly avowed by the most intelligent and experienced Protestant clergymen. “I love to see the filial eye, and full repose of confidence, with which the pupil looks on his own spiritual Pastor, as if he would trust him as, under God, the shepherd of his soul.” (*Thoughts on the point at issue, &c.*, by the Rev. Henry Woodward, p. 9, 1844.) Mr. Woodward would not, we are sure, have restricted this salutary influence to Protestant children. He directly denies a favourite allegation,—“I believe a comparatively small number of the Romanists of this country would wish their children to read the Scripture—unless their priests desired it.” (Ibid. p. 25.) In the same Pamphlet he laments the unscrupulous zeal of too many Proselytizers, especially referring to one person who had openly maintained that it was not

We all know the meaning of such averring. A peasant does not like to argue with "the master of forty legions," and simply answers (such at least is the common meaning of the reply) that she is a Catholic and abides by the direction of her Church. The Board decided emphatically against the managers of the school, but stated notwithstanding,

"After a careful examination of the evidence the commissioners are of opinion that in the management of the school, the committee were not influenced by any desire to convert the Roman Catholic pupils attending it to the Protestant faith, and were sincerely anxious to avoid even the suspicion of proselytism."

Proselytism can, on this principle, never exist till its success has been conclusive and the injury done is past repair. We assume the Board to have been perfectly sincere; but from that very sincerity we are obliged to infer that its notions and ours respecting proselytism differ very seriously; and that in its good intentions we can have no sufficient guarantee for the security of our children until its constitution shall have been rendered less unequal.

Let us now trace in their proper order the changes of Rule which have followed the two alterations of Principle already referred to, viz. that change which permitted of a combined as well as of a separate religious instruction, and that one which subverted pastoral, under the plea of setting up parental, authority.

The first has been alluded to in connection with another subject. It was suggested by the Presbyterian synod in 1833. It was assented to in the case of their schools; "gradually extended; and now obtains prominence in the rules of the Board. In reference to *vested schools* the following clause is contained in the trust deed, and also embodied in the present regulations. (Part i. sec. iv.)

"In all vested schools, the parents or guardians of the children have the right to require the patrons and managers to afford opportunities for the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the schoolroom, under proper persons approved of by the parents or guardians for that purpose."—p. 61.

The significance of this Rule appears only when it is taken in connection with other changes. It is but a link in

wrong to give a bribe to a Roman Catholic in order to induce him to renounce his religion. His Pamphlet, which is in defence of the National System, is written in the most admirable spirit.

a chain. It might be of use to Protestant children in schools under Catholic patrons; but their interests would have been far better provided for by the original rule which gave the clergy *as such* access to *every* school after school hours. It is not, however, Protestant children whose faith is assailed in Ireland at the present day; and to Catholic children the present rule is but poor compensation for the loss of that pastoral care originally guaranteed in all cases. Why is it the Bible only that is allowed to be thus introduced?

2. The next change relates to the place for receiving religious instruction.

"Lord Stanley's letter contains no reference to this, but the explanatory document, submitted to the Government, distinctly states that 'facility of access to the pupils at the times specified for religious instruction is to be afforded to the pastors of the children; that the choice of the place is left to the pastors, but that liberty is to be secured to them to assemble the children of their respective flocks in the schoolroom if they see fit.' (p. 65)..... This rule was violently opposed by the Presbyterians, and several of their schools withdrew in consequence. Rev. Dr. Cooke, in a public protest against the National system, thus describes this rule: 'The Romish priest is a visitor of the school, whether the committee will or not, and can turn out the Protestant children, *one day* in every week in the year, to teach that Protestants are heretics.' This rule, entitling the pupils of all persuasions to the use of the room for receiving religious instruction in it, continued in force until rescinded in January 1840, for the Synod of Ulster." p. 67.

Well may Archdeacon Stopford triumph in this alteration. Speaking of it in his Report of 1844 he says,

"The importance of the change can hardly be over-rated, whether we consider it in reference to the Board themselves, or in reference to National education at large. The Board, after having boasted of complete success in carrying out their system, have practically acknowledged that their only Rule, as to religious instruction, has failed; they have formally abandoned it in three-fourths of their schools, to which they now apply, without any discrimination, a regulation which might, except under peculiar local circumstances, be at variance with their fundamental principles.....So far as it (the change) extends, i. e. to three-fourths of the whole, it divests our National education of a religious character, and makes it, as such, merely secular." (p. 35-36.)

In Ulster those "peculiar local circumstances" do not commonly exist.

3. The next change relates to the *time* for imparting religious instruction. It is thus described by Mr. Kavanagh, p. 68.



"The rule as to the time for separate religious instruction is most clearly laid down in Lord Stanley's letter—one day at least, exclusive of Sunday, to be set apart for that purpose, and permission and encouragement to be afforded to the clergy to give religious instruction, or have it given by those whom they may approve, either before or after the ordinary school hours on the other days of the week.'.....The Presbyterians objected to this rule, because it afforded a *time*, and in their schools a place, for the Catholic clergy to instruct such children as attended Presbyterian national schools, and these days, so set apart, they designated as the '*fifty-two Popish holidays*.'.....In 1838, (Fifth Report) the rule as to the day was changed to 'one day in each week, or part of a day (independently of Sunday) to be set apart for religious instruction.' This was virtually given up in 1840, when the Synod of Ulster came to terms with the Board; and since the amended rules of 1842 (Ninth Report) consequent on the admission of the Presbyterian body, even the part of a day has disappeared."—p. 69.

4 and 5. Two other changes with respect to the time for religious instruction are thus pointed out.

"The permission and encouragement offered to the clergy to give religious instruction before or after the ordinary school-hours, on the other days of the week, were so altered, to meet the views of Presbyterians, that, instead of merely before and after, it could, for eighteen years, be given at any time, within, as well as outside school-hours," p. 74.\*

The occasion on which the next change was made is thus stated:

"Under the rules already quoted, the practice of making the 'sign of the cross', and repeating a brief prayer, each time the clock strikes, grew up in some of the convent and other Catholic schools, and when the commissioners made an order against it, many of the managers felt that they could not conscientiously prohibit a Catholic practice, which with many of the children is a domestic habit. The convent schools at Kells, Castlecomer, Sienna, (Drogheda) Cabra, and North William Street, (Dublin) gave up the grants mainly because of these restrictions; many of the other convents have been exposed to serious annoyances on these grounds, and at present, some excellent National schools are threatened with suspension, as the patrons refuse to direct the teachers to prohibit the practice in the schools." p. 73.

---

\* Directions were, however, we believe, given that this permission should not be used in such a way as to prevent the school being attended by any children otherwise disposed to frequent it.

This change of rule is considered by the patrons affected to have been in direct violation of the legal deeds which, during twenty-one years secured to the schools now so unwarrantably interfered with, the privileges in question; and consequently is regarded as a breach of faith. (p. 230.) Protestant children are seldom to be found in convent schools; but if they attended them they would see in the sign of the cross nothing but what every peasant in Ireland is as much accustomed to as he is to any domestic usage or to the salutations which he hears by the wayside.

Mr. Kavanagh thus sums up his "history of the variations" in this matter.

"At present the managers of all non-vested schools may refuse to set apart *any time*, weekly or daily, for religious instruction, or they may allot a time for any denomination they may think fit, and refuse to do so for all others. All the changes made have been for Presbyterians, and against the interests of Catholics."—p. 74.

6. The next alteration in the rules, to which reference need here be made, was the momentous one effected by Archdeacon Stopford. A correspondence on this subject arose between the Archdeacon and the Board, of which the following account is given.

"His (the Archdeacon's) objection was, that whilst the Rules of the Board had been modified, from time to time, the covenants in the Trust Deeds had not been altered to harmonise with the Rules, and under these circumstances Archdeacon Stopford requested, and reasonably, to know by which would he be bound, the Deed which he should sign, or the Rules which were *then* in force." He writes: "There is a sentence in the Rule above referred to which does not seem sufficiently definite for a legal instrument. The sentence to which I allude is as follows: 'That no child be compelled to receive, or be present at, any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object.' This, as I understand it, might mean either—that no child be compelled to receive, or *be compelled to be present at*,—or it might mean, that no child be compelled to receive, or *that no child be present at*, &c. There is an important difference between the two constructions of the sentence. I would bind myself to the former; *I would not bind myself to the latter*."—p. 87.

This representation was made at the end of 1844, but failed for a considerable time to extort from the Commissioners the concession demanded. In 1847 he renewed the correspondence, which had been more than once broken off, and at last with success.

"The result was, that the interpretation which he desired, and which alone he would bind himself to observe, was assented to by the Commissioners, and a grant made to his schools. In the Fourteenth Report, (1847) sec. 89, dated 16th of June, 1848, this change involving the complete subversion of the National System, not only as founded, but as carried on for sixteen years, is thus announced, &c."—p. 88.

A change from a mode of expression, to say the least, so equivocal, that the words complained of excluded from participation in the National System many conscientious Protestants who joined it immediately afterwards, was introduced as simply an authoritative exposition of something already clear! To this Mr. Kavanagh well replies, "had the force or import of words altered from March, 1845, when the Commissioners, with Archdeacon Stopford's clear and fair criticism before them, refused to answer his question?" This subject is also strikingly illustrated by Archdeacon Stopford's evidence before the Select Committee on National Education, in 1854, and by his pamphlets of 1844 and 1847. His statements entirely agree with the account of the transaction given above. The following is his evidence.

"Previous to putting your schools under the Board, did you receive from them satisfactory explanations?—I did; after the lapse of about a year and a half; at first they declined to give me any explanation; but after the lapse of a year and a half, they gave me satisfactory explanations.

"So that it does devolve upon the parent himself to withdraw his child, and he could not claim from you the right of your telling the child to leave the school for him?—Yes, that was the explanation given.

"Do you think that some of the Clergy of the Established Church are labouring under a similar misapprehension to that which you yourself laboured under, previously to your giving your adherence to the Board?—*I do not conceive that I laboured under any misapprehension.*

"You put a *different interpretation* upon the Rule to that which was given by the Board?—*No; the Rule was altered to meet my views.*" p. 91-2.

To the same purpose is the following evidence given by Mr. M'Cready, Head Inspector, and himself a Presbyterian.

"What was the practical construction? Was it left practically to the Teacher to put them out, or was it left to parental authority to enforce itself?—My opinion is that for a long period it was understood that the obligation lay upon the Patron and upon the Teacher of the school to put out the children. . . . .

"Do you believe that this modification, or this explanation of the meaning of that ambiguous Rule, with reference to the attendance of the children, has met with universal satisfaction?—It has very generally satisfied the Protestants, and it was, I may say, at their instance that it was so explained; but I do not think that it is perfectly satisfactory to some Roman Catholics. If they were consulted, I believe they would recur to the old interpretation put by some upon the Rule, and that is, that the children whose parents do not personally approve of their being present should not be allowed to remain during the time of religious instruction."—p. 93.

No doubt they would. A parent at work miles off may know very little about what is taught in a school; or he may have some suspicions, and yet, from negligence or intimidation, may fail to interfere, unable to estimate the full force of temptations to which he was never himself exposed in youth; or lastly, he may have ordered his child to leave the school at the commencement of religious instruction, and yet that child may on this, as on a thousand other subjects, disobey him, not liking to encounter the ridicule of his companions, to face a storm of rain, or to walk home by himself. On the other hand, let those to whom the school belongs, be responsible for the child's attending no religious instruction not sanctioned by his parents, and there is comparatively little danger of his doing so. Here is a case in which parents might have looked for some support from the eloquent assertors of Parental Right. They would have looked for it in vain. We shall have to recur to this subject at greater length.

7. The next alteration in the Rules was the supplement to that last named. When permission was first given to infringe on the original principle of the National System, by the introduction of religious instruction during the hours of *combined teaching*, that concession was vindicated on the ground that provisions had been made of a kind so stringent, as to render the abuse of the concession impossible. One of these guarantees consisted in a Rule by which the objection of a single parent, whether Catholic or Protestant, sufficed to banish, not of course from the school, but from the hours of *combined instruction*, any religious book which he deemed perilous to the faith of his child. (p. 25.) The security thus afforded was done away with in 1853, when a Rule, the converse of that one which preceded it, was introduced. It is thus described: "This

Rule was altered in July 1853, and the extracts and sacred poetry, which are still in use, cannot now be removed, as a portion of *combined instruction*, so long as a solitary pupil does not object to read them." (p. 28.) About the same time, a book to which Catholics objected, "*Lessons on Christian Evidences*," was removed by the Board from their list. "The result to the Catholics was a victory far more disastrous than a defeat." Each single Catholic parent must now lodge his separate objection to dangerous books. Nay, he must go on reiterating that objection, no matter what efforts may be made in opposition to his wishes, by men to whom he rightly shews respect on every occasion in which his religion is not concerned. It is often those whom in temporal concerns he looks up to as his benefactors that he has most to fear. Can any one say that against their solicitations the ill-informed and dependant need no protection? No one will say this who is aware how often Proselytizers have succeeded in wringing from starving peasants a reluctant consent to a still worse course of education; and how bitterly those parents have lamented their weakness when too late, on discovering that schools from which they had anticipated no permanent results, had changed their children into the fiercest enemies of the Catholic Religion.\* Children whose parents approve of the books in question are always free to study them during the time set apart for separate religious instruction. Assuming the necessity of a change in this Rule, that change might still have respected the original rights of Catholic parents. The children of Catholics might at least have been prevented from attending such instruction, except when able to show a *written consent* on their parent's part. But such a corrective was rendered impossible by the preceding change of Rule, since which

---

\* This is well put by the Rev. Mr. Woodward. "You admit on the one hand that the Priests are averse to the introduction of the whole Bible into schools. \* \* \* You allow, therefore, that if the Roman Catholic children attend your schools, they do in so grave a matter renounce the authority of their Pastors. All this you admit, on the one hand; and on the other hand, you disclaim the design or wish to make these children proselytes."—(*Thoughts on the point at issue*, &c. p. 35.) Elsewhere he ridicules the ordinary subterfuges. "If like the medical Doctors, the teachers can *warrant* to the Roman Catholics, that this medicine (though nauseous enough to them) may be taken by their children *with perfect safety*; what is all this," &c. p. 38. Would that all his brethren understood this!

patrons are not bound to remove any child, under any circumstances. The two Rules act conjointly like the two limbs in the same pair of shears.

An endeavour is sometimes made to diminish the force of the changes we have referred to, by maintaining that the Non-vested Schools should be considered as constituting a wholly separate system, supplementary to the original National System, and therefore not bound by its principles. But facts will not correspond with this theory. The National Education of Ireland does not profess to consist of two opposite systems. Every change has been assumed to be in harmony with the original principles of Mr. Stanley's Letter, which is still appealed to as authoritative. The professed object of the system continues to be the same as at first, viz., the education of the Irish people without interference with their religious faith. Once admit that the system is not one in principle, as in aim, and all effectual control over it must cease; for it would be as easy to maintain that the Model Schools constitute a system of their own, as that the Non-vested Schools do so; and innovations not yet foreseen, might thus in time claim their place, each as a "chartered libertine." The Non-vested Schools have become the vast majority. We have no objection whatever to them; on the contrary, we regard them as the best, if provisions were but made to prevent their working unequally. What we complain of is, that to promote their increase, especially in the north, concessions have been made at variance with the solemn engagements of the National System. So far as those concessions promote the more religious education of our Protestant fellow-countrymen, we are heartily in sympathy with them: but this advantage might have been gained without compromising the rights of Catholics. When the National System was introduced the Catholics of Ireland became entitled to a fair, if not to a perfect system of education. The State became morally bound to carry out that system to the full extent of their wants, no matter whether others availed themselves of it, or threw vexatious obstacles in its way. To vary that system to the disadvantage of Catholics, retaining still its name, seems to us a violation of faith.

8. The next change to be noticed is one by which Convent Schools are seriously affected. It is thus set forth:

"A new Rule has been also introduced, designed to check the



extension of Convent Schools in large towns, and which refuses aid to more than *one* school under the same religious community. In Limerick the Sisters of Mercy have *branch schools* in different quarters of the town, which they attend, going from the convent in the morning, and returning thereto in the evening."—p. 244.

Conventual Schools, conducted by men, are no less discouraged by a similar rule, which may take its place here as change the 9th.

"In the new code of 1855 the following rule has been introduced: 'No clergyman of any denomination, or (except in the case of Convent Schools,) member of any religious order, can be recognised as the teacher of a National School;' and as Monastic Schools had always been referred to under the generic designation of *Convent Schools*, this rule attracted little notice. The citizens of Cork, anxious to extend the excellent Monastic Schools of their city, applied for, and obtained from the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, a site for a school, the grant having been made on condition that it was to be a National School. When the school was ready to be opened, under the Brothers of the Presentation, it was only then ascertained that no grant can now be given to monks' schools, the rule referred to prohibiting aid to any school under a religious community of men."—p. 245.

\* The injustice thus suffered by the Conventual Schools both of men and women, is the more flagrant when we call to mind two circumstances: 1st, that Model schools, under the exclusive patronage of the Board, are being extended over all parts of Ireland, in spite of the reclamations of the clergy: 2nd, that the Conventual education so obviously natural in a country predominantly Catholic, has again and again received the most unqualified praise from Protestant no less than from Catholic authorities. Among the former are the Protestant Bishop of Derry, Dr. Higgin, and Mr. Stapleton, who says, "I heard a class in this school (King's Inn Street, Dublin,) asked Scripture facts, and found a correctness and readiness of answer which I have not yet seen surpassed." Mr. Maurice Cross, Secretary of the National Board, stated to the Lords' Committee in 1854,

"I am persuaded that in Conventual Schools the literary instruction is conducted with even greater advantage and success than in many of the ordinary schools. That is caused by the fact that the Convent Schools are conducted by a number of ladies of superior acquirements, whose vow and duty it is, according to their religious order, to attend particularly to the education of the poor, and who

take the greatest pains in promoting their literary, moral, and religious instruction. Their schools are models with regard to discipline, neatness, and cleanliness; in fact, *the Convent Schools present, generally, the best specimens of education that Ireland can produce.*" p. 242.

This evidence is confirmed by that of the Rev. Mr. Carlisle, the resident Commissioner, Dr. Kelly, and Dr. Henry, as well as much to the same purpose obtained from the enquiries of Her Majesty's Commissioners of Endowed Schools.

The evidence in favour of the education given by the Christian Brothers is fully as strong.

"The enquiry of the Endowed Schools' Commission has, in one respect, settled the question of Popular Education, and decided that the Christian Brothers' Schools have the best system of instruction, and attain the highest results of any schools in the kingdom. Not merely in the Commissioners' Reports, general and special, but in the reports of the two Commissioners who dissented from some of the views of their colleagues, we find the preeminence of those schools put forward."

A. S. Crawford, Esq., Assistant Commissioner, thus reports:

"Of Parochial, National, Convent, Monastery, Church Education, and many other schools of this class, the most efficient, in my opinion, are the schools managed by the community of Christian Brothers; and I attribute this efficiency to the excellence of their system, the training of the teachers, and their zeal in the cause of education."

The following evidence bears on that most important subject, the difficulty in our busy times of retaining children at schools long enough to make their education a reality. It is to be found in the Report of the Commissioners, p. 247:

"We refer to the interest which well-taught pupils feel in the studies they are carrying on. We have observed that in schools where the teachers take the greatest *interest* in the progress of the scholars, and where the standard of instruction is highest, the attendance in *senior classes* is *unusually large*. We have before us one Return—that of the Christian Brothers, in Richmond Street, Dublin—from which it appears that, in a school deserving this commendation, out of 644 pupils in attendance, 188 were between the ages of 12 and 18 years."

The importance of this subject becomes the more striking when we learn that, so difficult has it become to re-

tain pupils long in school, not more than one-fourth part of the children in all the National Schools of Ireland are occupied with the third, fourth, and fifth "Books," and can read a simple narrative. (p. 347-8.) The demand for labour must of itself prove fatal to all education which does not, both by the religious character of the schools, and the *personal influence* of teachers, profoundly affect the feelings of pupils and parents. Conventual Schools being, by the confession of all parties, the best schools existing, whether as regards literary progress, or moral and religious training, one might have hoped that every thing would have been done to encourage them. In principle there was no objection to them.

"In 1832, Lord Stanley, the Irish Government, and the new Board of National Education, unanimously admitted Convent and Monastic Schools to a participation in the public funds for education, on the same terms as all other schools, just as the Kildare Street Society had done, many years previous."—p. 249.

This has not continued to be the case. "The number of ordinary National Schools has increased fourfold since 1837; the number of Convent and Monastic Schools has little more than doubled." The latter being out of all proportion better than the former, it would hardly have been unfair if they had received more of public assistance. Unfortunately the contrary is the fact. "In the aggregate of 4854 *ordinary* National Schools throughout Ireland, the salaries average £49. to each 100 pupils in daily attendance; in the 117 Convent Schools the salaries average £22." (p. 235.) The reason of the difference is this. Originally a capitation grant, proportionate to the number of the children, was paid, of equal amount whether the school was under secular or conventual teaching—

"This capitation rate continued, with slight modification, in the National Schools generally, up to 1839, when classification of the teachers was introduced; and this, for the first time, made the grant of salary to teachers depend, not upon the number of pupils taught by them, but mainly upon their personal scholarship, with occasional consideration of their skill in imparting it. This rule at once excluded the Convent and Monastic Schools from its advantages, as it could not be expected that the members of the communities would submit to its provisions."—p. 234.

The classification of teachers may be a very good thing :— does it not appear, however, to be applied after a fashion a little too rigid, when its practical result is to give to the best teachers less than half the salary paid to the rest ? So in the case of the Monastic Schools conducted by men. “The Christian Brothers early joined the National Board, but a few years experience of the system satisfied them that such a connection would frustrate the higher object of their mission.” In 1837 there were, in connection with the Board, eighteen schools under monks ; there are now but five. Would it have been impossible, at least in those districts of the south where there is not a single Protestant, to have permitted the Catholic children to have availed themselves of the best possible education without forfeiting the fostering care of the State ? Would this have required more of indulgence than is shown in the north, where, under the name of National Schools, Dissenting Meeting-houses receive an educational sanction from the State ? It can hardly be thought strange if the Christian Brothers decline to teach in schools where the sign of the cross, and every emblem of the Christian religion is prohibited. What is the consequence of this one-sided liberality ? The victory of the State ? No : that of the Church. The novercal policy of the State succeeds for the moment ; the watchful tenderness and serene strength of the mighty Mother makes way on the long run. Slowly, but surely, an education more wholly Catholic than Catholics insist upon, besieges, without aid from Parliamentary grants, the citadels of intolerance. External to the National System 50,000 boys are trained by the Christian Brothers. Convent children, perhaps alone of all those educated in Ireland, are taught to pray for their Queen. What does the State gain by repelling their loyalty ? Does it aspire to make Ireland ultimately one great Educational Monastery, based on the Voluntary Principle like the Irish Church ?

“In Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Wexford, Clonmel, Tralee, Dungarvon, Ennis, Dublin, Kingstown, Drogheda, Kells, Mullingar, the Christian Brothers are gradually monopolising the education of the great bulk of the Catholic youth, while the Franciscans and Patricians in the West, and the Presentation Brothers in the South, have important and numerous attended schools.”

With great significance does Mr. Stephens thus remark :

"The education of congregated masses must finally govern the education of a country, and in the progress of this enquiry (that on endowed schools) I had seen proof that the education of the masses of the people, in the great centres of population, is passing into the able hands of the Christian Brothers to the exclusion of the *National Board*."—p. 246.

9. This list of changes may be concluded with one which, had it not encountered a timely opposition, would have placed at the feet of the commissioners the whole National education of Ireland. It is thus referred to :

"The incorporation of the national board in 1845, and the refusal to aid further the erection of schools, unless *vested in the corporation exclusively*, at once arrested the extension of Catholic vested schools. The resolutions of the bishops in 1847, and the decree of the council of Thurles in 1850, against either vesting schools in the commissioners, or transferring to them the trust in those already vested in local trustees, absolutely prevent the Catholic clergy from being parties to accepting building grants on the new terms."—p. 364.

The resolution of the bishops alluded to above is the following :

"That notwithstanding the explanation so kindly given by His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, we are still of opinion that the changes introduced in the national system of education are most serious and dangerous ; that they are in opposition to the instructions of the holy Father, who recommended that the property of the schools should be vested in the bishops and parish priests. That we therefore petition parliament for the amendment of such portions of the system as we deem incompatible with the discipline of our Church, with the full and free exercise of episcopal authority, and with the safety of the religious principles of our Catholic children."—p. 412.

It was in vain that the synod of Thurles thus recorded its protest against this innovation.

"We consider highly objectionable the rule recently made by the commissioners against granting aid towards the building or furnishing of school-houses, unless where the sites of these school-houses are vested in themselves. It is clear that this rule is a great obstacle to the erection of school-houses by Catholics ; it is therefore of the deepest interest to Catholics that it be forthwith rescinded by the government." p. 413.

It was not the Catholic clergy only that opposed themselves to what must otherwise have resulted in a huge Bureaucratical institution based on centralization and at

variance with all those principles of personal exertion and the cooperation of classes, as well as of individuals, which lie at the root of the better part of our modern civilization, and have so largely promoted the cause of education in England, together with that of mutual good will and self respect. The opposition triumphed, as is proved by the following statistical returns.

"At the close of 1857 there were 5455 schools in connection with the Board, of which 3780 were *non-vested*, over the property in which the Board had no control, and 1674 *vested*, to the erection or furnishing of which the Board had contributed. The *vested*, unlike the *non-vested* schools, cannot be withdrawn from connection with the national board, without incurring a penalty, and the control which the commissioners have over them is set forth in certain written instruments called bonds or trust-deeds. Of the 1674 *vested* schools the observance of the rules is secured by bond in 91; 969 are *vested in local trustees*, and 614 *vested in the Commissioners in their corporate capacity*."—p. 355.

When schools are vested in local trustees the result is of a mixed character. Such schools on the one hand incur more stringent obligations than if they had remained non-vested; on the other they enjoy greater rights, and a more secure hold of the benefits extended to them, the Board being bound to them by reciprocal obligations. But if the schools be vested in the Board, the influence of the central body becomes then greatest. It can, as we understand, depose the Patron, and elect another: nor does there remain, since 1845, a power of withdrawing such schools, upon refunding that small part of the building fund contributed by the Board. Most probably the same instinct led to the creation of the Model Schools, which led to the change of Rule above mentioned. It operates as a serious impediment to the erection of schools.

We now proceed to the second division of our subject, that of changes which have gradually taken place in the National system, apart from changes in its *Rules*.

Of these innovations, the most momentous is the multiplication of Model schools. In Mr. Stanley's letter, a single Model school, to be erected in Dublin, with a view to the training of teachers, is pointed out as one of the duties with which the commissioners are charged. It was afterwards suggested by some of the Catholic prelates that there should be four such institutions, one for each of



the provinces, but only in order to save the young men in training from the necessity of going to Dublin. They have now been multiplied in their different classes, to above the number of 100; their primary object, the training of teachers, has become but a secondary one; and they are schools for the locality. The special character of the Model schools is this, that in them the influence of the Board is supreme. In them the Board has the largest power of limiting or of modifying the religious education, though they can never exclude it; and, as patron, they may require the use of all the books sanctioned by themselves, several of which, if objected to on religious grounds, as for instance a volume of devotional poetry composed by Protestants, can be excluded by private patrons. These schools, in short, represent the teaching authority of the State; the ordinary schools representing that freedom of education in which a sphere is allowed to local, popular, and religious influences. In them the secular character, which is the drawback and danger connected with mixed education, reaches its acme; and from their size and pretensions they affect largely the education given in the neighbouring schools. The Rev. Mr. Fraser's report of his close observation of the working of the model schools in Marlborough Street last year is as follows:

"As the *normal* schools of a country represent its educational thought—as in them principles of popular instruction find their highest exposition and application—I begin by examining them. There is playground superintendence and a *desire* to train morally; but this, on the theory adopted, is impracticable. The highest authority is the human, not the Divine; the will of the creature, not the will of the Creator, is the power that can publicly be acknowledged.....The general tone of the teaching is decidedly unfavourable to that higher and purer morality which should be carefully inwrought in early life. I spent several days in the institution, and now write guardedly when I say I saw in its public work nothing to indicate a belief in Christianity, and little indeed that was more than decently Deistic."—p. 182.

Mr. Fraser being a Protestant, his evidence is not likely to be biassed by partiality to Catholics. His tone is, we think, exaggerated, yet few will be surprised at our not regarding a school which any conscientious man can thus describe as a safe place of education for 2,000 Catholic children, many of whom are afterwards to become the

teachers of the youth of Ireland. These Model Schools sometimes are set up, it would seem, in rivalry of the ordinary National Schools, and flourish at their expense.

"In 1847 they opened the Village Model Schools, Glasnevin; in July 1849, the West Dublin Model Schools;.....in October 1854, they opened the Inchicore Railway School.....In addition to these schools, the Commissioners contemplate erecting other *divisional* Model Schools throughout the city, and for this purpose, sites are desired about Newgate, Smithfield, and other localities. The central Model Schools are now being extended by the addition of *seven* new schools, and it is estimated that the new buildings will afford aggregate accommodation for 3,000 pupils, which will raise the annual strength of the Board's pupils to 7,000. The Catholic Clergy of Dublin thus stand a fair chance of being gradually superseded in the direction of the education of all but the very poorest of their flock, and the matter has already become of the gravest importance."—pp. 184-5-6.

The desertion of the parochial National Schools for the model National Schools, in the hands of the Board, is thus explained:

"As if the more effectually to carry out their object, the Commissioners have grossly neglected the ordinary National Schools in Dublin, which has rendered their own more attractive, and thus drawn thereto Catholic youth from the entire metropolis.....To the large Catholic schools in the city the Commissioners deny adequate teaching power, average salaries, and efficient inspection."—p. 183-4.

The latter statement is illustrated by the following remark, from which it would also appear that, before long, the children in the Dublin Model Schools alone, about nine-tenths of whom are Catholics, will number, when compared with the children in the Dublin National Schools under the Catholic Clergy, as 7 to 18.

"There are 65 National Schools under the Catholic Clergy, in the city, and these are frequented by about 18,000 children, or 9,000 in daily attendance. The attendance in these 65 schools is about equal to that in 260 ordinary schools in the County Tyrone; to the latter the grant of salary is £5,206; to the former less than half that sum." (Note in p. 184.)

It is but fair to add, that this disparity may be accounted for in part by the circumstance of the northern schools being smaller than those of Dublin relatively to the number of teachers.

Within the last few months we have ourselves witnessed some remarkable illustrations of these statements. We have visited in Dublin not a few of the ordinary National Schools under local patrons. Incomparably the best of these were the schools at Phibsborough, attended by about 1000 children. These schools, which were under the patronage of the local clergy, afforded a complete model of what national education ought to be, the instruction, whether in reading, in science, or in music, being first rate. These schools had just been cast off by the Board, because the patron did not think it right to prohibit the sign of the cross, used in them for years, and thus to compromise the other rights guaranteed by the same Trust Deeds! On the other hand in many other of the ordinary National Schools we were very much disappointed at the character of the instruction. We found teachers of an inferior class, and a bad method of teaching, ill-furnished schools, a miserably poor attendance of the children on the roll, and in very many of them, an almost entire absence of all except the youngest children. On enquiring why children of a more advanced age were not there, we were informed that they had gone, in many cases, to the Model Schools. Close to one of the schools thus neglected, we observed another, large and solidly built, and evidently well supported. On reaching it we found that it was one of those which proselytizing zeal gets up for the benefit of Catholics. Three hundred children attended this school, nearly all of whom, we were informed, (for we were not allowed to see them,) were Catholics. The teacher admitted that they received food, and we think, clothes, at the school, but insisted upon it that it was not on that account that little creatures of six and seven years old, attended, but from pure thirst for Scriptural knowledge! Here is the picture made perfect, the text with the comment—an ordinary National School neglected—a good Model School,—and a proselytizing Ragged School supplementary to both.

The practical working of these Model Schools is thus described :

“The superintendence and chief direction of all these schools is Protestant; the teaching staff is largely Protestant; all the books are non-Catholic, and some of them anti-Catholic; a mere Pagan morality, and a ‘common,’ or more dangerous ‘Christianity’ pervade the teaching; the Scripture prints of Protestant Societies are

the only ones used; every trace of the symbolism of Catholicity is banished." p. 186.

Sufficient has been said to explain why Catholics disapprove of such Model Schools needlessly multiplied. But two more objections remain behind. These Schools are without any guarantee either for Catholic discipline or for Catholic instruction;—yet they receive boarders, and they profess to impart those higher departments of education into which the question of religion must needs enter. It is easy of course to teach reading, writing, arithmetic, and geography, apart from religion; but when lectures are given on history, on logic, on general literature, and on education, as an art, it is next to impossible but that the religious convictions of the lecturer will give to his lectures a bias far the more dangerous, in consequence of its being perhaps unconscious. If the lecturer has himself deduced from history, or from philosophy, no lessons, either favourable or unfavourable to Catholicity, history must have been to him but "an old almanac," philosophy and literature things as worthless as colours are to the blind. He may indeed resolve to lecture on these subjects in a manner to exclude all reference to that which is their soul and their life; but it will not be easy for him to keep his resolution, especially while treating history, the moral of which depends so much on the mere selection of the facts recorded, and on the relative collocation of them, independently of any inference. The effect of the absence of collegiate discipline, where young men are drawn away from all the salutary restraints of home and neighbourhood, is thus set forth.

"These lads (the pupil-teachers) are from sixteen to eighteen years of age, are selected by the Inspectors from among the monitors, and advanced pupils in the model and in the ordinary schools, and reside, during their course of training, in the Model Schools, where they receive free board and lodging for one or two years. In each Model School the eight lads are mixed as to religion; in half of the institutions the resident Head Masters and their families are Protestant or Presbyterian, and in the other half the second master, resident also, is Protestant. Whatever defence may be set up for mixed *day* schools, few have ever advocated mixed boarding schools, as in them moral and religious culture are practically impossible."—p. 192.

\* \* \* \*

"Catholic Inspectors pointed out the extreme danger to morals, arising from the domestic circumstances in which teachers, boarders, and servants were placed, and from the absence of the active restraints which religious culture would impose upon them so exposed."—p. 193.

The rapidity with which the Model Schools have been advancing within the last few years, is in itself sufficient to account for the growing alienation of the Catholic clergy from the system.

"Since their incorporation in 1845 the Commissioners have established, or have decided on establishing, the following classes of schools, under their own exclusive management. 1. Literary District Model Schools, (2) District Model Schools, with an Agricultural Branch, (3) Special (as Railway) Model Schools, (4) Agricultural Model Schools, (5) Divisional, or Branch (Town) Model Schools, (6) Ordinary Schools in towns, and (7) Ordinary Schools in poor rural localities.".....The most important are the District Model Schools....."These institutions primarily are superior *Ordinary* National Schools for the inhabitants of their several localities, and secondarily serve as *Preparatory* Training Schools for an average of eight resident Pupil Teachers annually in each. The Parliamentary estimate for 1858-9, sets down the staff of these 14 *District Literary* Model Schools at 80 Principal and Assistant Teachers, 125 Paid Monitors, who are only senior pupils, and 104 Resident Pupil Teachers, who are *boarded and lodged on the premises*, and to whom only, in the strict sense, the establishments are *training* Institutions. Without interest on the cost of erection and fitting up, which amounted fully to £120,000, the expense of annual repairs, which is considerable, or the heavy item of inspection, the maintenance of these 14 Establishments is set down at £12,440, and clearly the training of 104 lads, some of whom spend *two* years in the District Model Schools, and many of whom never become teachers, cannot be a leading object to justify such an enormous annual expenditure."—pp. 188-9.

What a pity that all the money, talent, and pains bestowed upon these Model Schools should be converted from good to evil, by the introduction of an erroneous principle! They are in fact minor 'Queen's Colleges,' the principle of which is condemned alike by all religious denominations. No attempt is made either to conceal or to palliate their faults. So far as the boarders are concerned the defect of religious discipline might apparently be corrected by giving up some of them to Catholic boarders, and others to Protestant. This system has never been adopted in the Model Schools,

though, in the case of the Queen's Colleges, from which, by the way the Board seems to have drawn many of its inspectors, Denominational boarding houses have been advocated by the favourers of those institutions. If the Model Schools have forfeited the support the clergy were at first disposed to give them, it is because the pertinacity with which they resist modifications which might easily render them of high use, gives but too much cause to fear that the National System itself was but the introduction of the narrow end of the wedge, the broad end being a system of State Education for all classes of society, the middle and the higher, as well as the lower, such as has ceased to be attempted in any country but Ireland. Half an hour in the evening, and the same time in the morning, on four days of the week, and one or two hours on the fifth day, are set apart for religious instruction in these schools. Religion is by no means excluded: those who like it may practice it: it is patronised; but it is not fostered; nor can it be.\*

---

\* A more striking contrast there cannot be than that between the Central Training Schools in Dublin and such a training college as the Church of England possesses (to name but one out of many) at St. Mark's, Chelsea, under the admirable superintendence of the Rev. Derwent Coleridge. Like the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, built by our Catholic ancestors, it has its common hall, its library, its cloisters, its garden; but above all its church. We have before us a pamphlet,<sup>(a)</sup> describing this institution, from which we extract the following. "At nine o'clock the pupils of the college, together with the entire school, attend a full cathedral service in the college chapel. The solemnity and devotion with which this is celebrated must impress every one that takes part in it, and doubtless exercise a great influence in the spiritual culture of the inmates of the college.....The building, which is a very striking one, in the Byzantine style of architecture, has been so fitted as to leave the nave for worshippers not connected with the institution.....It is with a reference to the use and capabilities of a college chapel, in which the students and school children form not merely a full and efficient choir, but a principal part of the congregation, that this method has been introduced; the probable destination of the young men as teachers (in connection with their

(a) A second Letter on the National Society's Training Institution for Schoolmasters, St. Mark's College, Chelsea. By the Rev. Derwent Coleridge, M. A., Principal of the College.



The spirit of the whole is *unreligious*: the essential character of the system is such as to render morally impossible that cordial cooperation on the part of the local clergy without which its religious provisions, such as they are, become of little avail. "Intermediate schools" for the middle classes will doubtless in good time be the "stair-case" to unite the "two stories" of that educational fabric consisting of the National system and the Queen's Colleges. The Rev. Dr. Mac Ivor, in his letter to the Right Rev. Dr. Higgin, one of the commissioners, from which we have already quoted, refers to this subject significantly, and states that, owing to the want of qualified pupils, "the Queen's Colleges languish or threaten to fail;"—to remedy which defect he recommends "to multiply the number of *small* model schools." p. 201.

We have alluded to model schools of an agricultural kind. Of these a considerable number are scattered about the country, and they have we believe done much good; but would that good have been diminished if the chief training school connected with this department had been subjected to religious discipline? There are in it not fewer than eighty boarders. The following evidence, given by Dr. Kirkpatrick, can hardly be satisfactory to any religious person who remembers the temptations to which youth is subject.

"Are you a member of the Church of England?—I am not: I am a Unitarian.

"At Glasnevin you have persons of every shade of religious opinion admitted, have you not?—Yes.

---

other duties) of sacred music, furnishing an additional motive." The key-note of all this truly ecclesiastical education is thus struck:—"In common with the Christian philosopher whose name I bear, 'my fixed principle is that Christianity without a Church exercising spiritual authority is vanity and dissolution.'" And what is that ritual of which Mr. Coleridge thus beautifully describes the lasting effect on the schoolmaster's whole life, "It leaves a vibration in the heart to which vice may put a stop but not time"? It consists of but a few extracts, scattered leaves blown from the boundless forests of our ancient breviaries and liturgical books. And yet the Church which created these, and retains them, has no means, for want of properly trained schoolmasters, to introduce vespers or compline into her own parish churches, and to work out the mine of devotion in the hearts of her children!

"The lads all live in the establishment at Glasnevin, do they?—In the new establishment they do.

"Is there any prayer in common for them?—No.

"Is there any household prayer at all?—No; but every facility is offered to the pupils for attending their respective religious services."

On the *order of the day* "Devotional Exercise" is marked for half-an-hour, morning and evening, and under the head "General Rules" we find, "Neglect of attendance at divine worship on Sunday, and other days set apart for religious duty, will be looked on as a serious offence." To make such directions real, religious authority is necessary. Place the Protestant and Catholic boarders in separate houses, and discipline will at once become practicable.

That several of the National Schoolmasters should have lost their faith and left their Church is not surprising. The evil done is more often expressed in the character of schoolmasters, and in the spirit in which they discharge duties so elevated and so minute that religion alone can qualify for them. We need hardly quote here the high ideal set forth by M. Guizot, as to the function, character, and training, of the Schoolmaster. It was in vain that the Catholic Bishops of Ireland in 1840 and again in 1850, protested against a mode of training directly condemned by the Papal Rescript of 1841. The evil has continued unabated;—so has the absence of religious discipline. In this respect the central model school is worse than the Queen's Colleges, the students at which are at least free to reside with their parents, as they may at Trinity College, Dublin. In the central training school the State sums up the whole of that influence which it derives from all the various ramifications of the system, with its paid-monitorships, its pupil-teacherships, its inspectorships, and its model schools. Three out of the five Endowed Schools commissioners, though they recommended the mixed system in day schools, expressly condemned it at schools in which residence is required. No religionist, no moralist, no philosopher defends it except on grounds of temporary expediency. For England no statesman would vindicate it. To approve even this part of the English system is by some regarded as almost an act of disloyalty on the part of the Church and the people of Ireland. Yet, all the world over, it is where the State endows and protects a

Church that it expects a reciprocal deference from that Church.

Let us consider next the character of the books. According to Mr. Stanley's letter, as we have seen, the Board was to have furnished at a cheap rate to the children of each religious denomination such religious books as they required. It has produced a very different sort of educational literature. The portion of it which has attracted most attention is the "Scripture Extracts." It is with reference to them that Mr. Carlisle says that, though he could not conscientiously have placed a school in connection with the Kildare Street Society, he can place it under the National Board, because the latter affords greater facility than the former for scriptural instruction. "Do the rules of the Board admit of your giving explanations of the Scripture Extracts while the scholars are engaged in combined instruction?—Certainly." Such was the working of the system until 1853. In that year a rule was made prohibiting the teachers, except at the time set apart for religious instruction, from putting to the children any *other* questions than those appended to the end of each lesson. Virtually however, the Scripture Extracts must ever take their character chiefly from the teacher who examines in them. Mr. Carlisle's explanation of this matter will not prove generally satisfactory even to his co-religionists.

"Is each master to be the judge of the explanation for himself? —He is superintended by the parents of the children, who would make a complaint if they conceived improper instruction was given. Are the parents of the children in the school at the time? —No; but they can easily find out from their children what sort of explanation is given." p. 31.

Such is the protection for Catholic children!

Next we find some 13 or 14 reading lessons or common class books. It does not happen that a single one of these was written by a Catholic, though they are used by more than half-a-million of Catholic children. These volumes, though wholly distinct from those professedly on religious subjects, contain notwithstanding a vast deal upon topics which would generally be thought religious. The Board itself says,

"Lessons on the subject of religion, drawn chiefly from the narratives of the Holy Scripture are interspersed through all the read-

ing books, and constitute an interesting epitome of sacred history. These are commenced in the first book, and carried on through the remaining volumes. The lessons in the first book are of a moral kind, and conclude with one decidedly religious: several in the second book are of the purest and most elevated kind: and the next work following affords a striking example of the successful manner in which some of the most important truths of revelation are blended with secular instruction in the Irish National School Books.....Apart from the scriptural lessons contained in the fourth book it contains several poetical pieces of a *devotional character*. .....The supplement to the fourth book contains a summary of the Old Testament including a detailed account of the Prophets, and the substance of their prophecies; besides several essays by Archbishop Whateley and other eminent divines. The excellent lessons in the Girls' Reading Book form a complete manual of moral and domestic duties, whether in single or in married life."—p. 40-1.

This is the *ordinary* instruction which in the province of Ulster alone, thirty thousand Catholic children receive from Protestant teachers! Does any one seriously suppose that such instruction can with propriety be given by teachers of one Faith, to pupils of another? These common lesson books have their extracts from Protestant divines, and also from Infidel historians; but so singularly destitute are they of citations from Catholic writers that a child brought up in the study of them might imagine that Protestantism alone had a literature. From lessons without end on merely material facts, scientific morsels and fragments of natural philosophy, he gets glimpses, here and there into the world of morals and religion; but he is as far as ever from the teaching of his Church. It is from writers who probably looked with contempt on his Faith, that he is to learn his earliest lessons of Old Testament history and New Testament doctrines; and passing by the multitudinous harmonies of his Church, whose every breath is song, his devotional feelings are to be trained by the hymns of Wesley and of Watts! Of the history of his own country he is to learn nothing! but he is taught to sing his thanks to the "goodness and the grace" which made him "a happy *English* child." These books already constitute no small part of Ireland's cottage literature. Why should the Irish Catholic remain content with these? This is no necessary part of mixed Education. The English Catholic chooses his school books from a list of more than a thou-

sand volumes all sanctioned by the Privy Council, written by persons of all religious opinions, and many of them admirable alike in their secular and religious departments.

The next great change in the National System, as compared with the aspect it presented at first, results from the mode in which its administration is conducted. The real working of the machine has been placed predominantly in the hands of Protestants, the less important places only being ordinarily given to Catholics. The proof of this statement will be found in the construction of the Board itself, of the Central Training Department, and of the Inspection Department. In many cases the inequality may have arisen accidentally, or been produced by a temporary difficulty. It is from no party spirit or pique, that we require something approaching to a fair distribution of influential places. Catholics naturally are alive to the interests of their co-religionists: Protestants, even with the best dispositions, may be ignorant of them, and may, from that ignorance alone, fatally compromise those interests. The same principle which requires that Catholics should be represented at all, in the working departments of the system, requires that they should be fairly represented. Let us commence with the Board. It consists of fifteen members. Of these nine are Protestant, and six only are Catholic. Considering that something like six-sevenths of the children in the National Schools are Catholic, few impartial persons will regard this as a fair arrangement. The Catholic body has no voice as to the appointment of the Catholic Commissioners, nor can it enforce their attendance at meetings. They are appointed by the Lord Lieutenant, who cannot be a Catholic, and without whose consent the Commissioners cannot make rules. Nor is this all. There is but one Resident and Paid Commissioner, and he is a Protestant. Mr. Macdonnell's character places him above all suspicion of partiality, as regards proselytism, and he has the highest reputation as an accomplished gentleman and scholar. But why should he not have a Catholic coadjutor? The Commissioner in constant residence is of course the one by whom the general working of the system is chiefly determined. On this subject we have the evidence of Mr. Cross, who says:—"I have no doubt whatever that the business of the Board generally, cannot be effectively administered by a numerous Board; that is my decided opinion after

long official experience. In fact, the ordinary business is now transacted chiefly by Mr. Macdonnell, who is the Resident and only Paid Commissioner, myself, and my brother secretary."

Proceeding from the Board to the Central Establishment, it appears from a table given at p. 287 of the "Catholic Case Stated," that its staff is thus arranged. The Heads of Departments include twelve Protestants, with salaries amounting to £5330 per annum. To balance these we find three Catholic officers, with salaries amounting to £1320 per annum, viz., the junior secretary and two *first class* clerks, not one of whom has the direction of a department. Counting the clerks of inferior classes, the staff of the Central Establishment consists of twenty-nine Protestants, and but twenty-one Catholics, the former with salaries amounting to £7,545, and the latter with salaries amounting to £3,546 per annum.\*

Let us now look at the important department of Inspection. In the three southern provinces we believe that the Catholic Inspectors bear a fair proportion to the Protestant, when compared with the number of Catholic and of Protestant children at school. But it is in Ulster that there is the nearest approach to united education. It is in Ulster that the Roman Catholic body is weakest, though even there it has a numerical majority in the National Schools: it is in Ulster that the greatest attempts at proselytism are made. It is therefore in Ulster that the greatest efforts to prevent abuses should also be made through a system of inspection impartially administered. But what do we find there? A table in p. 121 answers this question. The Catholic children in the National Schools of Ulster amount to 100,128 in number, the Protestant to less than 73,000. The Catholic Inspectors are two; the Protestant are twenty-one. Nor is this all.

"The distribution of the staff was similarly Protestant, while all these abuses were growing: and since 1846, with the exception of a short period, the Head Inspectors in Ulster were, and now are, Protestants and Presbyterians. The two Catholic officers are

---

\* Within the last few months a slight improvement has been made. A Catholic now shares with a Protestant the direction of the Training and Model Schools; and another Catholic shares in that of the Inspection Department.



juniors in service and station—one a second class, the other a sub-Inspector, and Queen's College man. Six of the Protestants are First Class District Inspectors; the two Head Inspectors, who control the Catholics, are Protestant and Presbyterian."

Surely if the case were reversed, our Protestant fellow-countrymen would not admit that it was mere party spirit that made them discontented with such a state of things as this. The evil is not confined to Ulster.

"A corresponding allocation of the Inspectors favours and promotes the Protestant element in the District Model Schools. Dunmanway, Waterford, Limerick, Kilkenny, Galway—all most Catholic stations—Baillieborough, Newry, Belfast, Ballymena, Ballymoney, and Coleraine, (11 of the 14 District Model Schools,) in operation, are in the immediate charge of Protestant, Presbyterian, or Unitarian Local Inspectors."—p. 189.

In the Model Schools we find the same striking inequality, and here, the Board being supreme in them, we might have hoped that a model of administrative fair play, as well as of educational progress, would have been aimed at. As regards the teachers in the Central Model Schools, we find that, while over four-fifths of the pupils are Catholics, of the instructors in the boys, girls, and infants' school, but eight are Catholics, while twelve are Protestants. (p. 180.) It is in the infants' department of the Model Schools, both in Dublin and elsewhere, that this inequality is most remarkable.

"In the Infants' Department, in the Board's own Model Schools, they are almost invariably of that (the Protestant) creed. In the Central Model School both the Teachers of the Infants' School are English and Protestant; in the West Dublin, Athy, Kilkenny, Clonmel, Limerick, Galway, Trim, Newry, Belfast, Ballymoney, and Coleraine Model Schools, they are all Protestant, the only Catholic Head Teachers being in Ballymena and Waterford. In a few only of these 14 schools are the Catholics in a minority, and in nearly all the others the Protestants form but a trifling fraction of the attendance."—p. 46-7.

To these very young children, more than to others, the mistress stands in the position of a mother; and by none are religious impressions received with more susceptibility. That such impressions should not, in the case of Catholic children, have a Catholic character, is a grave misfortune to them.

Here we must remark upon the anomalous position in

which Catholic Teachers are placed by the circumstance that while the Board disposes of a vast patronage, and thereby exercises a vast influence, it on many occasions sets itself in very needless opposition to the principles and wishes of the Church. Catholic Teachers at least must count Pastoral Authority for something; yet they have often to act in direct opposition to it. If Model Schools are established in places where they are opposed by the Clergy, Catholic Teachers may be also "compelled to instruct Catholic, and non-Catholic children in books condemned by the Catholic bishops, and Catholic Inspectors to examine and report upon the proficiency made in such works." (p. 194.) Nothing of this sort was originally contemplated. The Synod of the province of Dublin, in a Pastoral address to the Catholic clergy and laity, dated July 1853, expressly enjoins the disuse, so far as Catholics are concerned, of the "Scripture Extracts, owing to the facility with which the questions subjoined to each lesson might be made ancillary to erroneous teaching." Master Murphy's evidence in 1854 (*Queries 8866-7-8*), is to this effect.

"The Rule, as it stands at present, appears to me to impose upon a Teacher the duty of teaching the Scripture lesson, and Sacred poetry, whether he will or no: when we come to deal with this question, we shall be involved in very serious embarrassment."—p. 195.

Dilemmas of this sort are as bad for the moral as for the religious character of the teachers, a class whose influence and example must tell very much upon the population at large.\*

---

\* "The Schoolmaster—whether he have to teach the letters of the alphabet to a class of little children, or the elements of physical science to a meeting of young mechanics—has in every case, an object in view, with which these and the like lessons may indeed be combined, but to which they must ever be subservient. In every case he has to educate the religious instinct, to guide opinion in morals, and to impart a knowledge of revealed truth—a knowledge the most sublime that can by possibility become matter of instruction, which yet must form a part of the most rudimental teaching." (Second Letter, &c., by the Rev. Derwent Coleridge, p. 50.) It hardly seems consistent with these high functions that the schoolmaster should be the person to set an example of disobedience to the wishes of his Church.

"Considering the restrictive principle of the System in relation to religious instruction, and the anti-Catholic spirit in which it is administered, it cannot be matter of surprise that Catholic Teachers, whose promotion is entirely in the hands of the Inspectors, should fear to exhibit any appearance of religious zeal in the discharge of their school duties. . . . The emancipation of the Teacher from clerical control is one of the aims of the system, and, misled by the pernicious influences to which they are subjected, too many of the schoolmasters, in foolish conceit, have swerved from that allegiance and respect which are due to the pastors, and not alone on the grounds of religion, but also as their employers". . . . "While a paid monitor, from twelve to sixteen years of age, this Catholic lad had been the mere creature of the Inspector, who fined him, disgraced him, removed him, promoted him, voted the Teacher a gratuity for his instruction, or disallowed it. At sixteen or seventeen years of age his Inspector sends him to a District Model School, where he is a boarder, under one or more resident Protestant Teachers, his fellow-boarders in every case being of different creeds: the least objectionable aspect of their domestic life is the entire absence of distinction, or notice of any religious practice whatever as a portion of their daily personal duties". . . . "The Catholic Pupil-Teacher, now eighteen or nineteen years of age, proceeds to complete his course of education, to the Marlborough Street Institution. Thus are the professional aristocracy of the Catholic National Teachers now raised, the creatures of the State, brought up, at the most important periods of their lives, apart from the Church, and if preserved from indifference or hostility towards her, it is by supernatural means, and from no merit in the system under which they are trained. These being the most accomplished teachers, obtain the best endowed institutions under local patrons, appointments in Model Schools, Colonial offices, Clerkships, Organisations, and in many cases, Inspectorships."—pp. 218-19.

The Dissenting communities, like the Church of England, train their teachers in such a way as to make them the best representatives of the sect to which they belong, and a due link of connection between the intellectual and the religious element included in it. This is as it should be. No Catholic would wish it to be otherwise. Surely in spite of sectarian prejudice, a similar advantage might be conceded to Catholics. To rule by dividing is a principle carried too far when divisions are sown between the teachers and the pastors belonging to the same Church. Teachers are disqualified for their function by a System which does violence to their conscience.

System, we now proceed to its actual working. No system which is unfit for the Catholics in Ulster, can, so long as it remains unreformed, be worthy of the imposing name of 'National.' The Presbyterians have effected some curious modifications of it. The National System has been hitherto complained of as an irreligious one. Our readers will find that, so far as Presbyterian interests are concerned, it is in one sense so religious that schools, under Presbyterian patrons, are used as "meeting houses." The series of concessions seem to have originated so long ago as 1840, when, in reply to the Rev. Dr. Steward, the Board wrote :

"1st. Any lectures or addresses, whether accompanied with prayer and singing or not, connected with the religious instruction of the children attending the National School, would not be regarded as a violation of the Rule. 2ndly. That the attendance of the *parents of the children, or their connections*, during such lecture or address, would not render it a violation of the rule. 3rd. That in the opinion of the Board, such lecture or address, being given by a clergyman of any denomination, or by a layman, makes no difference."—p. 114.

The following is the Rev. Dr. Cooke's statement.

"When we have built our own school-houses, we insist upon, and receive, the right of having *every use of them*, out of school-hours or school-days ; whereby I mean that we may have them for Sabbath schools, or we may have them for week-evening meetings, for prayer, or for preaching, at our discretion."—p. 115.

The Rev. T. Campbell gives evidence thus :

"Are you aware whether or not it is in conformity with the Rules of the Board to deliver lectures, and give religious instruction to the pupils, at which the parents and friends of the pupils can attend, and are invited to attend?—It is ; *but I am aware that under the guise of doing so they are open to the public.....* Such a practice may be in conformity to the concessions lately granted to the Presbyterians ; but I take it to be *in direct opposition to the original Rules of the Board.*"—p. 117.

The Rule, as amended in 1855, permits such use of a school, with the single and obviously useless reserve, that it is not to be employed as the "*stated place of worship of any religious community.*" The locality of the school, and its usages, are of course perfectly well known ; there is, consequently, no necessity for making any *public statement*, in order to render it available for those in the neighbourhood. There happens, however, to be one other

provision which effectually prevents Catholics, if so disposed, from using their schools as district chapels. The erection of an altar, and the celebration of sacraments, are prohibited in schools. The Sacrifice of the Mass is therefore inadmissible; while prayer, preaching, psalmody, and congregational attendance, all that is necessary for ordinary Presbyterian worship, are permitted. We have no wish that our schools should be used as Catholic chapels; but the distinction here made speaks for itself. Its tendency is thus indicated.

"This use of the schools as *District Meeting Houses*, is not confined to rural localities, but appears to be most generally practised where churches and meeting houses are most numerous, namely, in Belfast and its vicinity.....The patrons of many of these schools are, landlords, mill-owners, employers, clergymen, and persons whose position and wishes influence the Catholic tenants, mechanics, labourers, and struggling classes, and the Catholic children, once permitted to join in the daily instruction from Protestant teachers, or clergymen, during the ordinary hours, the evening lecture, and the psalmody, or prayer meeting, held in the same school room, a few hours later, can present no aspect so revolting as to scare their attendance."—p. 122-3.

We shall now turn the page and look at the Catholic side of National Education in Ulster. The result of the evidence we shall quote amounts to this, that Catholic children are sent to places which, under the name of schools, are probably better adapted to the purpose of making the pupils Protestants, or bad Catholics, than they could be if avowed meeting-houses. In our list of changes we have already referred to one which was conceded after a protracted fight, that change, namely, which cancelled the original rule, relative to the removal of children when religious instruction opposed to the faith of their parents was being imparted, and left it to each individual parent to withdraw his child, exonerating managers, patrons, and teachers, from responsibility in the matter. Every body knows that however exaggerated may be the charge of exclusiveness, commonly brought against Catholics, they at least are not latitudinarians. Catholic parents so far resemble Protestant parents, that they wish to see their children brought up in their own faith, and consequently do not wish that they should derive their religious instruction from persons of an opposite one. But most persons are also aware

that the right of "private judgment" in this matter is by no means conceded to Catholic parents by multitudes of Protestant landlords, agents, clergymen, and other influential persons; and that too often the severest pressure is used, in order to induce them to consent to their children's receiving Protestant instruction. Let us now see how far the wishes of parents have been carried out in schools from which pastoral authority has been banished under the specious plea of vindicating parental.

The following is the evidence of Mr. McCready.

"Do you believe that in point of fact the Roman Catholic children attending the Presbyterian schools are directed to withdraw, by putting up the board, giving notice when the Bible is read?—It is required by the rules of the Board that they should have such notice given to them, but *not that they should be directed to withdraw*. Do you believe that Roman Catholic children do withdraw when the Bible is read?—Not universally; in many parts of the North of Ireland the Roman Catholics read the Scriptures with the Protestant and Presbyterians, and *if they were left to themselves, I believe they would do so very generally.*"—p. 98.

The "Bible" means the Protestant Version; and by "left to themselves" Mr. McCready seems to mean left without pastors, or pastoral advice. What Protestant children in similar circumstances might do, under Catholic landlords, equally exacting, he does not inform us.

The following is the testimony of Dr. Cooke, one of the chiefs of the Presbyterian body.

"Do these Roman Catholics generally continue in the school at the time of prayer?—*I think they all do.* And during the time of the reading of the Scriptures, in the course of the secular education, do they also attend?—As far as I know, they not only are present, but read the Scriptures as readily as the other children do.".....—p. 99.

Evidence of the like nature is given by the Rev. C. King Irwin, who remarks:

"My impression is, that Presbyterian ministers and masters manage their schools just as they please, in total disregard of theoretical rules," and "in almost every instance where I asked the question, 'Was the Bible read by all, or did any object,' the answer was, 'none object.'"—p. 100.

The 'theoretic' rule is, that the parents' wishes should be carried out; and that rule is disregarded for the simple



reason that the practical rule, by which it would have been enforced, has been repealed.

A. G. Stapleton, Esq. enquires of the Rev. Dr. Edgar, the Systematic Divinity Professor in the General Assembly's College, at Belfast, as to the cause of so remarkable a phenomenon. With great frankness Dr. Edgar answers him thus:

*"The Presbyterian schools are connected with the National Board, on their own conditions. They make it a rule to read the Scriptures in all the schools, and the Roman Catholics attend them."*—p. 101.

But the most incontestable evidence on this subject is that of an Inspector of the Board itself; and this brings us to the celebrated case of Mr. Keenan and the "suppressed portion of a Report." It is referred to in the Catholic Case Stated," (p. 109.) and at more length by the same author in his pamphlet entitled "Mixed Education"—the "Catholic Case and its Catholic Advocate vindicated." We quote from the latter (p. 44).

"In his General Report (Board's 22nd Report, vol. ii. p. 49.) Mr. Keenan states that in the year 1855 he had regularly visited 44, and incidentally visited upwards of 150 other schools, from which, coupled with his official intercourse with the District Inspectors and others, he had 'frequent opportunities afforded him of becoming intimately acquainted with the exact state of education in most parts of his circuit,' which embraced the whole, or portions of seven of the nine counties of Ulster, and contained upwards of 1000 National Schools. This Report extends to seventy-five pages, and disusses every feature in the working of the schools, with the exception of their practices, as to *separate* Religious Instruction, and this, which was struck out by the National Board, I now submit, from the Parliamentary Paper that has been issued, since the publication of the 'Catholic Case.'"

Mr. Keenan describes *five* different practices in the National Schools of Ulster. The fifth is set forth as that

"Where the Teacher and *part* of the Pupils were of *different* denominations, and the Teacher gave a *common* religious instruction to *all*, *none of them retiring.*" This fifth practice "was confined exclusively to schools which were conducted by Protestant (*Presbyterian*) Teachers. In *all* the schools which I visited in Belfast, which were taught by Presbyterian Teachers, and in which there was a *mixed* attendance, *this practice prevailed*; indeed, it is pretty general throughout the counties of Antrim and Londonderry, but I never

observed it to prevail in any other part of the country. By this practice Religious Instruction is *separate* as to *time*, from the ordinary literary business of the school, but not as to a distinction of the denominations, whilst religious instruction is going on. I have brought these different practices *already* under the notice of the Board in my *ordinary* Reports upon the Schools, and have therefore no occasion to enter further into them here. Rule 16, section iv. (as to 'Notice to Parents,') was not in operation until the end of last year, but the Rules *then in force* relating to Religious Instruction, and parental right, were in all cases complied with."

The Catholic children thus educated in religion by Protestant Teachers, appear to have exceeded 11,000 in number.\* For excluding the above passage from Mr. Keenan's Report, as laid before Parliament and the country, the Board assigns the following reason :

"The above passage from Mr. Keenan's Report was omitted by direction of the Commissioners, because, in the year 1855 the Commissioners had passed their new Rule, on the subject of Religious Instruction, for the purpose of preventing the possibility of any child, in a National School, attending Religious Instruction given by a teacher of a different faith from that of the child's parent, without that parent being fully apprized of the fact; but it was not until some time (above three weeks) after Mr. Keenan had closed his inspection of the Ulster Schools, that the forms of 'Notice to Parents' alluded to in the Board's Rule, part 1, sect. iv. para. 16, and the object of which was to secure the free exercise of parental authority in the matter of Religious Instruction, were issued to Teachers for the use of their schools. . . . The Report of Mr. Keenan itself, from which the passage was expunged, in which the practices of some northern schools, as regards Religious Instruction, are commented on, did not reach the office until the 14th day of July, 1856, at which date the new Rule had been at least six months in operation, and must, therefore, it was presumed, have brought the government of the Schools in conformity, in this matter, with the Board's Rules."—Catholic Case and its Catholic advocate vindicated, p. 45.

This vindication Mr. Kavanagh condemns in severe terms, on four different grounds: 1st, Because, although the new Rule was directed to be brought into operation on the 1st Dec. 1855, yet no sooner was it issued than it

---

\* The Eglinton Returns show that so far back as 1852 the Catholic pupils in Presbyterian schools were 11,335. They are now, according to Mr. Kavanagh, 'not far short of 20,000.'

was objected to by the Presbyterians; and the Board yielded to their objections, and issued a Circular, stating that the New Rule was not to apply to any children who had already been attending the instruction complained of, but only to such as should do so *for the first time* subsequently to the issue of the notice. The Rule being thus modified, there remained nothing to prevent thousands of Catholic children from continuing *for several years* longer to receive Protestant instruction. 2ndly, He quotes Mr. Keenan to prove that "the notice-system is a mere sham." 3rdly, He shows that the notice, such as it is, applies, even prospectively, only to some out of the many cases in point. It runs thus:

"If any child of a religious persuasion *different from that of the Teacher* of any National School, attend during the time or times set apart for religious instruction given by such Teacher, it shall be his, or her duty, on the *first attendance* of every such child, during the time for such religious instruction, given by such Teacher in such school, forthwith to notify the same to the parent or guardian of such child, on and by a form, to be furnished by the Commissioners."—Cath. Case, p. 110.

From this it appears that "if a clergyman, or any person other than the teacher, gives the religious instruction, no notice need be sent." Still less need a notice be sent if the teacher be a Catholic, which is quite compatible with the religious instruction coming from a Presbyterian patron, who is asserted to select such teachers occasionally, "to allure the Catholic pupils to the Bible class." 4thly, The notice need only be sent once. If the attendance of the child be discontinued for a time, and subsequently resumed, it does not appear that any fresh notice need be sent. Various tricks are alluded to by which the notice can be rendered nugatory.

"Assuming even that the child is told by his parents not to attend the Teacher's religious instruction again, how can unsuspecting childhood see harm in it? If it be given as the first lesson, he arrives at school when it is going on, and he joins; it rains, or it is cold, and he takes shelter in the school, while it proceeds; if the last lesson, he has a distance to go, and he either joins or must listen, while waiting for his Protestant or Presbyterian companion or neighbour: these, the example of the teacher, the sympathy of numbers, or a hundred other circumstances attract the child to join in the lesson."—p. 113.

We shall join in no discussion as to the motives of the Board in this matter. It is fortunate in having escaped, on this occasion, the keen analysis of Archdeacon Stopford, its late 'Assailant' and present 'Panegyrist.' It is with facts that we deal. Very clever pleas are offered to our consideration no matter what we complain of. Have we not a right, like the prophet of old, to appeal to the senses, and ask, "What meaneth, then, this bleating of sheep in mine ears?" We do not want excellent reasons for our children being brought up in Protestant teaching: we want that they should be brought up in the faith of their fathers, no matter how unphilosophically. We want that this should be effected uniformly, and by means of self-acting Rules, *the only rules fit for Ireland*, and irrespectively of the amount of watchfulness which may prevail on one side, or of proselytizing zeal, on the other, at any particular period. Have we not reason to be on our guard when we find the (changed) National System advocated on such grounds as these?—

"Where the Church children are very few, it is invariably found that the system of the Church Education Society, even in the most diligent hands, cannot take any hold of the Roman Catholic population. \* \* \* If the Clergy, or even the landlords are in future to have any connection with the education of the bulk of the lower orders in these countries, it must be by means of some other system of Schools than that of the Church Education Society." (Archdeacon Stopford's Report, &c. p. 4.)

Well may he say, "the original system of the Board was evil;" but say also "a new system has been grafted on the former."

Parental authority! What we complain of is, that under the plea of protecting parents from pastors, the wishes of both alike are despised. If any doubt can really be entertained on the subject by unprejudiced persons, what could be so simple as to require that before the religious education of any Catholic child is placed in the hands of a Protestant clergyman or schoolmaster, the written or verbal consent of the Catholic parent should previously be obtained for a proceeding so extraordinary? The *consent* of the parent would speak for itself. The absence of *dissent* proves nothing. He may never have received the message: his answer may never have been received; the notice despatched may have been unintelligible to him; or its meaning may have been misrepresented by the

bearer. At all events every one knows that the Irish peasant is under pressure upon those subjects, and that a merely negative course is the one that recommends itself to timidity, procrastination, and dulness. His landlord, or the agent, may assure him that no proselytism shall be allowed at the school, meaning that the child shall be brought up in the Lutheran doctrine of Justification, but that no direct attempt shall be made towards a premature discussion on specially Catholic doctrines and practices, which, their centre having been removed, will hang loose, like dead leaves on a wintry bough, the sport of every blast. He may add, "if after this solemn assurance you withdraw your child, you tell me distinctly that I am a liar and a cheat!"\*

The whole of Ireland is full of proofs that this coercive pressure exists. It exists in the Church Education Schools, and in the Mission Schools, which make no attempt to conceal their proselytising aim. We rejoice to be able to think that a mode of proceeding, in itself so immoral, proceeds in many instances from a wide-spread misconception. Again and again Clergymen affirm their belief that the Irish people wish for such Scriptural instruction as they give them, and that they are only restrained by fear of their priests from gladly receiving instruction in the Protestant Bible! This curious notion is amusingly brought out in the following passage taken from Mr. Trench's *Digest of Evidence*, 1855. (p. 259.)

---

\* It is not zeal, or even Proselytism that we complain of, but the enthusiasm, or party spirit, which divorces these from charity, and which advocates supposed Truth by unjust or indirect means. The very kindest relations may exist between those who labour for each other's conversion. Would that Mr. Woodward's words might find way to men not more sincere Protestants than himself. "I have ever thought that, as things are, if our first and permanent object were to benefit Roman Catholics and their children, the best way of effecting this would be by redoubled efforts to train up our own children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (*Thoughts on the Points at issue*, p. 11.) Indifference as to other Persons being in the Truth not only is not allied to charity, but is a serious offence against charity, and one commonly founded either upon latent scepticism, or upon that contempt for Truth which belongs to practical materialism. It is but the *illicit* courses connected with missionary love and zeal that disturbs households, and confuses the spiritual sphere.

"Do you mean that they refuse to admit a child into their schools whom they have no power of compelling to listen to the instruction (i. e. religious) they offer?—They will not admit any child into their schools who *requires compulsion* on this matter; they do not compel the children to come to their schools, but still they come, knowing what they have to find there. *You cannot call that compulsion.*"

Considering that the child too often 'knows what he will find there,' in more senses than one, and that the parent occasionally knows what he may 'find,' if he does not let his child go there, this sentence suggests, at least to a Catholic, the idea of quite a newly invented sort of pressure, by which people are compelled to do what they dislike, and yet to do it "without compulsion!" To those who seriously regard their Catholic fellow-countrymen as the reluctant slaves of a tyrannical priesthood, of course the whole thing wears another aspect. Let them but act to the children of others, as they would wish their own children to be dealt by, and the delusion will leave them.

Among those most deeply involved in this delusion we must class Archdeacon Stopford, judging from his recent "Letter to the Right Honourable Alexander Macdonnell." It is written in part to repudiate what he seems to consider a charge brought against him in "The Catholic Case Stated," viz., that he had affirmed that an important rule, changed at his instance, had, previous to that change, enacted that Catholic children should be excluded by the patron from religious instruction of a kind opposed to the faith of their parents. We should have imagined that he would have thought the statement in question a high compliment to him. He appears, however, to deny that any such change of rule was made, either at his instance or irrespectively of it, maintaining that the original rule was "capable of either interpretation," and that nothing more than the clearing up of an ambiguity was needed or effected. Verbally he may be right. Morally very few persons will agree with him. The matter at issue was one of no less moment than this—whether managers of schools were, or were not, bound to exclude Catholic children when a species of instruction intentionally dangerous to their faith was going on. We have the plainest evidence of Mr. Blake and Mr. McCreed to prove how the Rule was originally under-



stood, as well as Archdeacon Stopford's own statements. Mr. Kavanagh, in reply to his recent letter, refers to a pamphlet of the Archdeacon's, published at the end of 1847, just after the change of rule had been effected, in which he says:

"The Board had themselves raised the question," (as to the interpretation of the rule,) "They had formerly gone beyond the most objectionable sense of the Rule. They had affirmed that it was of the essence of these Rules that the *patron should exclude from religious instruction all who were not actually directed by their parents to remain.*"—(The "Catholic Case and its Catholic Advocate vindicated," p. 85.)

The following is one of Archdeacon Stopford's plain statements in 1844.

"I have shown that the Rules bound the Patron to this course at least, (that of *excluding* children from religious instruction which their Parents forbade their attending,) if not to that stated by Lord Clancarty, up to 1843; that the Trust Deeds still bind him to it; that the ninth Rule (concerning notification) *positively*, and the third Rule possibly (although not probably,) require it still."—Report on the Schools of Meath, p. 70.

But it is not with this matter that we are chiefly concerned. The present Rule exists, and certainly it is *not* equivocal. When it was introduced, by whom, or under what plea, or to gain what object, is nothing to us. The Rule is highly injurious to us, and is diametrically opposed to the principles of Mr. Stanley's letter. Archdeacon Stopford, notwithstanding vindicates it, and on what grounds? On the ground of "Parental Right" versus "Pastoral Right."\* He says:

---

\* Archdeacon Stopford, to do him justice, has himself tolerably exalted notions respecting the teaching power of the clergy, as regards the problem of education. "I am persuaded this age will never find rest, nor peace, nor truth, until we set about to deduce from principles of truth, rules of action, suited to the existing necessities and circumstances of society.....It is painful to see how easily public men fall in with the tendency of the age—short-sighted and degenerate as it is.....It is painful too, to observe how this tendency is sometimes treated by the guides of conscience.....It is not enough that we keep ourselves clear. As ambassadors of God, as teachers of the state, we should testify to the principles on which rules should act. It is not enough to tell

"Mr. Kavanagh, writing under the superintendence of the four Catholic Archbishops, and 'in obedience to a call from the Church,' steps forward to demand that the State shall interfere to give the priest a compulsory power over the parent in respect of the education of his child. This is the question raised in the 'Catholic Case.' Priestly authority fails, and demands temporal support." (Letter to the Rt. Hon. A. Macdonnell, p. 13.) "The Priests have failed to control the parent's liberty, and it is demanded through Mr. Kavanagh that the State shall do it for them." (Ibid. p. 15.) "Power must be conferred by the State on Priests, to compel those parents whom they cannot persuade." (Ibid. p. 17.)

Again and again these assertions are reiterated. Perhaps their most unscrupulous expression is found in a passage in which the Archdeacon takes upon himself to set forth the aims of the Catholic clergy.

"We therefore demand, as absolutely necessary, that legal power be given us by the State, to withdraw the children against their own will, and the will of their parents." (Ibid. p. 20.)

---

them what a Christian state ought to be and to do. A description of what this world should be is but a poor guide to one who seeks his path through its tangled snares. We must look at facts as they are, and say how men should deal with them." (The Terms of Aid to Non-vested Schools. 1847. pp. 21-2.) To "teach the nations" only, requires but the sacerdotal function in its plenitude, with the Apostolic succession, authentic orders, mission and jurisdiction. To teach *States* also, and that with reference to the most arduous questions of mixed religious, ethical and political science, in which they have to deal not only with great principles, but with the application of these to the most complicated circumstances, requires a profound casuistry besides. The depositories of these astonishing functions are the clergy of the Irish branch of the United Church of England and Ireland. This is an interesting statement. We shall not contest it. But does not the Archdeacon think that, in this case, the clergy of a Church which has been in Ireland ever since St. Patrick's time, may have some trivial functions also? It may not be theirs, like the Jesuits of old, to direct "shortsighted and degenerate" statesmen, nor to sit in the tribunal of conscience when states or kings want direction; but may they not advise a peasant of their own flocks as to the religious character of a lesson book, or the wisdom of letting their children learn their faith from Protestant pastors—say, from the Archdeacon himself? As for the State, it may of course be the client, or the tool, of any counsellor it approves. We should have thought it however quite aware that it had already gone far enough in the way of theological legislation.

We should have thought it sufficient to deprive the clergy of rights guaranteed to them, without at the same time casting against them imputations insulting and gravely injurious. These statements have a practical character, as appears from the following warning, in which we are reminded of a cry which has never long slept from the time of Titus Oates and the Gordon Riots to that of Catholic Emancipation, and of which the peasant has again and again been the victim—" *Let Statesmen look to our civil and religious liberties.*" (p. 19.)

Archdeacon Stopford has been ill-advised. He writes with much logical point, and still more rhetorical skill; but facts are against him. Even as regards Mr. Kavanagh's book, we remember but one single charge out of the many score which he brings against the National System, (one which we have not quoted, and do not agree with,) to which the Archdeacon's strictures can with plausibility be applied. As to the assertions of the latter with respect to the Catholic clergy, the meaning of which is that they are tyrants, and that their people are their reluctant slaves, to coerce whom they vainly invoke the power of the State, we shall not descend to answer railing with railing. We content ourselves, therefore, with stating that the accusations upon which he has adventured are not true. The Catholic clergy do not find fault with the present National System because under it the State refuses to enforce their authority upon reluctant parents. Mr. Stanley's original provision did not *enforce* their authority; but it *recognised* it as an existing fact, and allowed a legitimate sphere for its exercise upon such as chose to acknowledge it. They object to the present system because a docile and devout flock can no longer procure for their children the *opportunity* of receiving from their pastors, or "persons delegated by them," that religious instruction which was originally guaranteed to them in all schools; while on the other hand successive changes of Rule have taken away from Catholic parents that security which they once enjoyed against the imparting of heterodox teaching to their children. Permit the Catholic priest to enter the school, as he was originally entitled to do, for the purpose of giving instruction to his own children. We think there is extremely little danger of their not receiving it; and if such a contingency should arise, he will no more lodge his complaint with "the State" than with

the Emperor of China, or the Royal Academy. He would have no such power of appealing to the State under the Denominational System. As regards the Protestant religious instruction given in the Non-vested schools, we have already stated that what we require is, that the wishes of parents should be tested fairly, and not in a deceptive mode. Throughout the whole of his pamphlet "parental authority" is Archdeacon Stopford's battle-cry. The advocates of the new Rule maintain that parents are with them. Very well! But is there any reason why this matter should not be tested? Let the *direct* written or verbal consent of the parents be obtained. The mystification will then have come to an end. Suppose the parent explicitly to *refuse* his consent, what then? Will the Archdeacon take care that parental wishes are held sacred? Nothing of the sort. He says in his recent pamphlet, (p. 12.) (and more distinctly still in his pamphlets of 1844, and of 1847, and in his evidence,) "Those who conscientiously disapprove of the parent's conduct cannot become his instruments to execute for him what they think wrong." Away then with this sonorous declamation about parental authority! The advocates of the Church Education schools hold in principle the same view of the matter as Archdeacon Stopford. We cannot but greatly prefer their line of action as indicated by the Right Hon. Joseph Napier, in a letter to the Rev. J. Mac Ivor, published in the year 1850. He says, "We should be honest and conscientious in whatever plan we accredit, or defend. I cannot go with those who profess to treat the Church of Rome on terms of equal claim to assistance in Education, and yet in secret, and by the contrivance of policy, hope eventually to undermine her foundations." "Pastoral," not "parental" authority is the right word! Only it should be explained to mean the authority of Protestant pastors to educate Catholic children in a religion opposed to that held by their parents!\*

---

\* In his "Report" of 1844, Archdeacon Stopford speaks unequivocally as to what he calls "exaggerated" views of parental right. "A parent may prohibit his child learning those commandments of God which, at his Baptism, he promised to keep.... Such a prohibition, even from a parent, we hold to be of no moral obligation whatsoever." (p. 78.) So again, in his pamphlet of 1847, he

It is very well for clerical disputants, whose allies are the newspapers, to pray in aid that big word "Ultramontanism," that polemical refuge of the destitute, in which bankrupt argument and blind animosity so often (now that the real meaning of the term is forgotten,) take sanctuary. But would these gentlemen have nothing to say if they found Catholic landlords and Priests obtruding Douay Testaments upon their Protestant parishioners? The principle of parental versus pastoral authority is not a weapon of *defence*, or there would be no objection to it, but of offence. It is to remain a dead letter as regards Protestants; it is a reality as regards Catholics. It is to be exercised on their behalf, but against their will; in defence of their liberty, but by men whom they distrust. It is advocated upon a principle (private judgment) which is to deliver them from spiritual bondage; but they regard the supposed bondage as a "glorious liberty," or they need not have suffered persecution for centuries on account of it; and the proffered freedom in matters of faith they regard as "license," the nomadic liberty of wandering tribes, who are free indeed to change their encampment every day,

---

says, "Were that child persuaded in his own mind, and capable of understanding, that he was bound to hear the Word of God, although prohibited by his earthly parent, and were he to present himself in my scripture class, I would admit him: that would not be interference with the child's religious persuasion. His persuasion would be an accomplished fact without my interference. Nor would it involve any violation of my obligation to the parent, as defined in my application to the Board."—(The terms of Aid to Non-vested Schools, by Archdeacon Stopford. (p. 51.) 1847. Grant and Bolton.) With the last sentence we are sorry to agree. From the rest of the statement we differ. We consider children thus used to be trapped, and their parents also. May we not ask how, except by having been *already induced* to discard the authority, both of his parent and his pastor, for that of a stranger, can a young child arrive at convictions in favour of what, under the name of the "Word of God," really means the Protestant Version of the Holy Scriptures, as well as Protestant instruction in them, and at Protestant views respecting the *particular place* assigned to the Bible in the scheme of Redemption, and the education of the human race? Every instructed person knows that the question at issue is not as to the value of the Sacred Scriptures, but as to their Rule of *interpretation*; not as to the preciousness of the treasure, but as to the key of the treasure-house.

but who have cut themselves off from the advantages of a stable home, and from the extended powers, as well as the ennobling restraints which belong to civilized communities in religion. If men want to know what 'parental right' really means, let them learn of Dr. Doyle, a prelate of a Church commonly accused of exclusiveness. For the schools in his diocese he drew up regulations providing for all Catholic children a thoroughly religious course of instruction, and enacting as follows for Protestants present in them.

"Whenever Protestant children attend, let them not share in the duties of prayer or religious instruction, unless at their own desire, *sanctioned expressly by their parents*; and where the number of such children will be at all considerable, the committee, if required, should afford time and place for religious instruction being imparted to them by a person of *their own communion*, and in the manner *prescribed by their own pastors*!"

We have now passed in review the principal changes made in the National System; and our readers will perhaps agree with us that, since the Vicar of Wakefield's silk stockings were so often mended with worsted that they became worsted stockings, few systems have changed more signally. So far at least we agree with Mr. Trench's "*Digest of Evidence*," to which is prefixed Mr. Stanley's original letter, annotated in such a way as to prove that but a small proportion of its engagements are now carried out. What, then, is to be done? Is the Board resolved to stand still; and if so can it show any reason why, having been so long in motion, it should at this particular moment, rather than at any other, come to a full stop? It may indeed proclaim that to it now belongs the happy mission of "*closing the cycle of revolutions*;" it may nail its weathercock to the mast,—until the wind blows from some less suspected point—but it does not follow that a proceeding thus cautious will be a prudent one. Several of the Statesmen who served on the Select Committee of the House of Lords, in 1854, were disposed to take a bolder line, and the appendix of Mr. Trench's book includes not a few suggestions "*intended to have been proposed*" by them. Lord Granville's proposal touched one of the earliest and most fruitful deviations from the original principle of the Board. It proposed that "*All religious instruction, whether denominational or general, given in the National Schools,*



and not contained in the National school-books, must be given at a separate hour, and publicly notified in the timetable, under the head of Religious Instruction." (p. 295.) The Earl of Derby, instead of thus binding patrons more severely than at present, proposed to allow them more latitude, of course equally in the case of Protestant and Catholic patrons. Among his suggestions was the following:—(p. 299.)

"That the Board be authorised, if they shall think fit, to grant similar advantages to those enjoyed by the non-vested schools, to any schools now existing, or hereafter to be built, whatever their regulations as to religious instruction, the patrons of which shall be willing to place them in connection with the Board, to admit the Board's control over books to be used in general instruction, and to receive officially the visits of the Government Inspectors."

This is a further development of the principle introduced when non-vested schools were first admitted. Theoretically it would assist the schools of the Christian Brothers as well as those of the Church Education Society—supposing the Board to be fairly constituted. Practically it could by no means do so unless accompanied by a law, absolutely necessary for the fair working of ANY System in Ireland—a law analogous to that by which sites are now taken for Coast-guard stations. It would also be obviously essential, in order to prevent proselytism, to allow pupils in every Irish school, whether Catholic or Protestant, to avail themselves of its secular instruction, without being compelled, directly or indirectly, to receive its religious. This is the arrangement made in Trinity College, Dublin. The suggestions "intended to have been proposed" by the Protestant Bishop of Ossory, are drawn up with much ability. One of them seems conclusive against the far-famed principle of "parental authority." It says, (speaking of the schools under the "Church Education Society for Ireland, which are supported by not less than three-fourths of the clergy, and about the same proportion of the laity" of the Established Church in Ireland,) "It appears that, in regulating the religious instruction which they give in their schools, not by the requirements of the children in attendance upon them, *or of their parents*, or of the State, but by the dictates of their own judgment and conscience, the

Irish Church is acting upon the same principle on which all denominations in England, with which organized educational societies are connected, act; and that in England the State acquiesces in that principle,"... ..and furthermore, that in a petition presented by the Archbishop of Canterbury, "5,414 of the English clergy have testified, concerning their brethren in Ireland, that in their steadfast refusal to connect themselves with the National Board, under conditions which would prevent them from instructing in the Holy Scriptures every child in attendance, they have only acted in accordance with the principles of the Church, and in strict fulfilment of their ordination vows." (Digest of Evidence, &c., p. 303.) Every child in these Church Education Schools is required to receive from Protestant teachers instruction in the Protestant Bible, whether his parents approve it or disapprove it. If this be the principle sustained by three-fourths of the Irish Protestant clergy—specially eulogized by 5,414 of the English—acted on in England by all Protestant religious denominations—and there sanctioned by the State, the Bishop is but candid in disavowing the principle of parental authority.

The Bishop, notwithstanding, would provide, as he states, for the carrying out of the parent's wishes, by furnishing him with a large choice of schools. His plan is, that in all schools connected, or to be connected with the Board, the secular education is to be such as the Board sanctions, while the religious education is to be enforced upon all attending the school, and determined in character by the will of the patron. This suggestion, it might be supposed, would give to Catholics and Protestants, something like a separate education, under the name of the Mixed System. In practice, however, the scheme would probably work very unequally. The superior wealth of the Protestants would enable them to multiply their schools everywhere. Catholic children might be often induced, by moral pressure, to go into Protestant schools, which (the system being still theoretically a 'mixed' one,) would continue to bear the specious title of 'national;' and there an instruction decidedly Protestant would be forced upon them.\* This

---

\* Where no equivocal Rules give rise to misconception, the faith

scheme is at once very simple and very complex. *Professedly* it would continue to be the 'mixed' system:— it would be accorded, however, on the *supposition* that it was to *work* "denominationally;" while yet it might well be *expected* to turn back practically into the mixed system, but without the safeguards of that system! A Denominational System should be such *avowedly*: and a 'mixed' one should be preserved from the dangers of proselytism by Mr. Stanley's simple provision of a "combined secular, and a separate religious education." Lord Derby's suggestion would *add* the denominational to the mixed system: the Bishop of Ossory's would *blend* the two in a sort of chemical compound, by no means of a safe character. Paradoxically enough, it would strain to the utmost the 'conscientious' rights of Patrons; while it wholly ignored, not only the conscience of Parents, but also that of the State, which would be educationally endowing two opposed Religions at once. All changes are good and safe in proportion as they lean towards the freedom of education: but, under the circumstances of Ireland, no freedom ought ever to be conceded to patrons which can limit the freedom of pupils. There is no reciprocity in this matter. Catholics do not consider education to be a legitimate means of conversion; and they do respect the legitimate authority of parents, whether Catholic or Protestant.

Our own remedy for admitted evils we have stated, supposing the door not yet closed against Reform. That remedy consists in reverting to the original principles of Mr. Stanley's letter, and either doing away with most of the changes which have since taken place, or, where that may be impossible by reason of privileges already guaranteed to Protestants, in that case giving to Catholics equivalents by which the original promise may be kept

---

of the Catholic child (and we are as much bound not to expose one child, as a thousand children, to danger) is seldom imperiled for any long time. Some ten or twelve years ago, the Church Education Schools boasted the attendance of about 50,000 Catholic children—whose faith, of course, was not to be interfered with, though they were to be instructed in the Protestant Bible. That number was, before very long, reduced to 13,000;—since which the National System is generally supposed to have been rising in the opinion of the Church Education Society.

in the spirit, if not in the letter. One of these equivalents we have indicated in our suggestion respecting the vexatious difficulties as to sites for schools, by which the best efforts of the State may be rendered nugatory, alike under the Mixed or the Separate System. Most earnestly do we hope that not only party spirit and personal interests may be set aside in the discussion of so solemn a subject, but that those who take part in it may remember that they are dealing with one of the deepest problems of moral, as well as of political philosophy, and may allow no more than a due weight to any considerations of a merely temporary character. Great principles may be modified in their application so as to meet the exigency of circumstances, but nothing can justify us in the maintenance of unsound principles. This applies pre-eminently to the State. Nothing can on the long run be for the interest of the State if it militates against the moral and spiritual well-being of any who compose the nation. The nation cannot help being composed of various religious bodies; but it can avoid aggravating jealousies by partiality and intolerance. The nation has lost the supernatural gift of religious unity; it need not throw away that which is next best, the natural and noble emulation of different religious communities, each of which should desire, not to depress its neighbour, but to enkindle its ardour in the race of piety and patriotism. It is freedom of education which admits of this generous rivalry. The principle of emulation, even in matters exclusively religious, produces such benefits that many writers have referred to it as an *a priori* proof that it cannot be by a single authoritative standard, but by the rival efforts of individuals or sects, that Religious Truth is to be ascertained. Of course we do not admit this statement, for we believe that the very word "Revelation" means that Truth has been already communicated to the Human Race; and that our ordinary duty is no longer therefore to ascertain it, but to maintain it in its fulness at once and its purity, and to live by it. But we too admit that, unity once lost, it is by a frank and kindly emulation, not by a forced or apathetic indifference, that the cause both of religion and of civil good will most prosper. Surely, then, we may expect those who are never tired of extolling free trade and unshackled competition, not to become the devotees of uniformity in education. We are far from railing at system, for it

has its due place, but system may easily become a bondage. There is such a thing as worshipping our Net, and burning incense to our Drag. A means to an end is not to be venerated as an end. Those who most ardently believe in "Mixed Education" might, we think, prove their confidence in their principles much better by allowing equal advantages to the Queen's Colleges, and to the Catholic University, and thus permitting their respective merits to be fairly tested, than by heaping endowments on the former and denying a charter to the latter.

The best things are those which, like the British Constitution, have grown up by the correction of abuses, and by adaptation to circumstances. The National System developed very soon into the freer and larger principle of Non-vested schools. Why should its admirers conclude that it is incapable of an analogous development now, but of one protected from those abuses by which the earlier change has been discredited? Is it even certain that two systems of education, the Mixed and the Denominational, could not co-exist in the same country, each assisted by the State, but the latter in a slight degree only? If so, what is the reason of this? It must be because *all parties* would concur, even at a serious pecuniary loss, in one thing at least, viz., a preference for the Denominational System. This is a strong statement. A system which no party in England would endure is, in this case, supposed to be now *forced* upon Ireland, where no party approves of it! We by no means make such a statement: we can easily see in each system of education much which would recommend it to many. It may be that the two systems, supposing them to be secured against the two classes of abuse, proceeding from exaggerated State-influence on the one hand, and from proselytising zeal on the other, would work better than either of them separately; each keeping the other in a wholesome check, and supplying that in which its rival was defective. On this, however we have no desire to dogmatize; but we implore our friends also to be incredulous as to the dogmatism of the State. A Mixed system which is to reconcile all parties, and yet which, according to its advocates, no party would accept if it had a choice, is an educational "comprehensiveness" which verges toward the transcendental regions of the incomprehensible. By all means let all persons be educated together who can be induced to

like that system—but none besides. Our Latitudinarian friends will not quarrel with us for rejecting only their narrowness. To bring people together is an excellent way of making them friends: granted—but occasionally when children quarrel they are separated. Moreover, other means might be imagined for doing away with old animosities in Ireland besides making rival disputants of eight years old cast up sums on the same slate.

We are not concerned at present to deal with the arguments commonly put forward against the Separate System, except so far as they are also arguments against any strenuous efforts for the reform of the present one. "Beware," it is sometimes said to us by persons sincerely opposed to proselytism, "how you move in this matter. You stand on the brink of a precipice. If a Denominational System were established it might be nominally in favour of Catholics and Protestants alike; but in reality the latter would be allowed to make it their own. They are rich and you are poor. The grant for Irish education might easily be reduced so low that even if you got a fair proportion of it you could not support your schools. The contribution of the State would be made to bear an invariable ratio to the sums locally subscribed for each school. The landed proprietors and the Established Church could supply such large subscriptions in aid, that for every school of yours they would have three; and in each of these the education would be of a more costly and therefore of a higher character. You have numbers; but the numbers would not tell much on the Government contribution, unless the latter were made in the form of a capitation grant; and no doubt for that reason it would be awarded in some other manner. Moreover, it would be easy for the State to deny all aid except where a substantial and permanent school-house existed. For such school-houses the landlords already refuse sites in several counties in the north. Why should they not refuse them all over Ireland? What would you do where the Catholics were but few? Is it not plain that there you would have no schools, and that even in the southern provinces the Protestant schools would be far nearer to most of your children—each of them supported by the landlord, sanctioned by the State, and in character determinately proselytizing, yet not avowedly such?"



This statement is exaggerated in its tone, for it ignores the fact that no conceivable sums can ever effect more than a certain very small amount in the way of proselytism; the number of persons willing to sell their children being limited. It is just at first that these enterprises meet with whatever success attends them. In every society a certain degraded class exists. The favourite vice, owing to the circumstance of some particular locality, may be that of child-selling, with the intention of ultimately defrauding the purchasers. Very soon, however, the latter have bought up the whole of their small market, and discovered that while they appeared to be making rapid progress they were only, in electioneering phrase, "polling their good baronies." Next comes the reaction, and they commonly discover that the only permanent effect of their zeal has been to correct some local abuses, and substitute a vital and energetic for a sleepy Catholicism. That Catholicism, on the whole, has greatly gained by the attempts of the "Missions," is as certain as the loss sustained by some individual souls. With reference, however, to immediate consequences, the warning is certainly alarming—so alarming, however, that it is very far from making us contented with the present system, though willing to acknowledge that by an imprudent course we might exchange it for one more immediately dangerous. The statement seems to assume that the Protestants are never to join the present system in the southern provinces, by joining which they would of course acquire a large power over it. We believe the contrary: nor can we regret the prospect, because our desire is, not '*to play a game*' in Education, but to see all parties in possession of their rights, leaving consequences to God.\* The statement also presupposes

---

\* Many persons, both Protestants and Catholics, tell us that we should be contented with the present system, whatever its defects, because, in the three Southern Provinces, it has been left chiefly in our hands. This seems to us as little the argument of policy as that of principle. Has not every outcast child in Ulster a soul as well as the comparatively safe multitudes of Munster? Again, have not our Protestant fellow-countrymen as good a right as we have to the benefits, in the South, of a system for which they are taxed? If they exclude themselves from it at present

that, after all that has been said during half a century about civil and religious liberty, freedom of conscience, and the like, the proprietary class in a large part of Ireland, and the State, are ready to enter into a conspiracy for the purpose

---

that is their mistake : it is only wonderful that they should have persisted in it so long : we have no right either to wish that they should perpetuate their blunder, or to rest the religious security of our children upon its perpetuation. They have been warned again and again of that blunder by several of their ablest men. Any chance occasion,—the Pastoral itself—may furnish them with a plea for changing their course: and, in spite of the conscientious objections we have heard of for a quarter of a century, we may discover at any time that “The Bible and the whole Bible” was a cry, not a principle ; and find the State, and the State-Church once more in their natural harmony. Archdeacon Stopford, in his pamphlet of 1847, gave his brethren warning not to be too sure that the English system is the best for them. “Theoretically the system is one of perfect equality; practically it favours the majority.....The Government may favour such a system where the majority are of the State religion, a religion that naturally tends to support the imperial Government; that any essential good is gained by a different system in Ireland may be doubted.” (p. 36.) The Archdeacon might have added that in England the majority, and the wealth, happen to be at the same side. The Catholics there however, though poor and few, do not complain. He has already shewn that in the National system *as modified by the changes in the Rules*, the clergy of the Establishment possess the power of maintaining all over Ireland Protestant schools with Protestant teachers. “With respect to all children who are now, or hereafter may be, committed to you by their parents, your position would remain unchanged ; you would continue to educate them for time and for eternity.....For children not so entrusted to you the Government have undertaken to provide secular education, and to employ teachers ; leaving it to their parents to take care of their religious instruction. They are anxious that your object and theirs should agree ; and with this view, those who administer the Government system are anxious to confer *their* office on the same individual *employed by you*.” (p. 15.) The Archdeacon proceeds: “it may be a matter of positive duty, and is deeply felt to be so by many conscientious men, to preserve in our hands the power of giving education its truly religious character to those who will so receive it, instead of throwing it into the hands of others, who will give it the stamp of error, or at best make it purely secular.” (p. 28.) A special reason for looking favourably on the National System he declares to be “that every change, almost without exception, was in

of assailing, in the most insidious form, the faith of that ancient and long-persecuted race by whose sweat and toil the landlords gain their wealth, and by whose valour the battles of that State are fought on sea and land. Is it

the right direction.....my only desire was to see those changes avowed and carried out." (p. 38.) Undue influence with children he says he would not use, but he adds, "There is a legitimate influence belonging to those who are really promoting, and directing intellectual activity—an influence inseparable from the successful performance of that duty—an influence which cannot be altogether separated from the persons who perform it, in their other relations to society." (p. 40.) So cogent is this reasoning that we cannot but believe that the Archdeacon's brethren must long since have regretted that they did not take his advice in time.

Mr. Mac Ivor, whose tone is generally friendly to us, in his pamphlet of 1850, assigns the same reasons for preferring the *changed* National System to any other. The right of Catholic parents to withdraw their children from Protestant religious teaching he vindicates on the unflattering ground that they "are not to be *required* either, all at once, to break through their conscientious belief, for the sake of obtaining some education for their children, or else to see them brought up as they have themselves been, in unmitigated Popery and social servitude, in material, and mental, and religious bondage.....Priests' or Popes' Interdicts *live* simply by the ignorance and superstition which causes them to be respected and obeyed. To remove the ignorance and superstition is the only effectual, as it is the only Christian way of condemning them to die. The National System proposes to us a large assistance in effecting this." (p. 20-1.) Again he remarks: "The Protestant clergy have a duty also to those who are, ever so conscientiously, *unwilling*. We ought to bring all our personal and ministerial influence to bear upon these, so as to place them also in connection with Scriptural truth." (p. 68.) Who could resist the following appeal:—"Let the National system be similarly judged, and let us see whether it be, *on the whole*, indifferent. As between Popery then, for instance, and Protestantism. 1. Is the nature and object of the Institution itself, the efficient diffusion of general education, equally favourable to both? 2. Is the 'large amount of religious, moral and useful instruction,' actually taught *before the hours* of special religious instruction, equally favourable to both?.....He is a strange Protestant who thinks so." (p. 72.) The practical application of all this is "Wherever the clergyman's exertions can now sustain one, generally weak, almost universally inefficient school, under the (Church Education) Society, he might have, if he chose, *one, two or three*, efficient schools under the Board." (p. 58-9.) No doubt, for if the Protes-

indeed so, and are so many years of professed liberality to have this sorry conclusion? We are convinced that a very large number of the proprietors would abhor such a course of persecution, and abhor it the more for being indirect; but let us assume that they would prove the minority, and be unable to influence the rest. Let us assume, also, that the State would allot to Ireland funds manifestly insufficient for so poor a country; that it would apportion those funds in the way most unfavourable to Catholicism; that it would attach to its contribution conditions impossible to be complied with; and that, finally, while it permits no rights of property to prevent the execution of a railway, it would allow all the highways of knowledge, of moral and of religious culture, to be closed against Catholics not prepared to abandon their faith.

If we are obliged to suppose all this, we must conclude that, under the present system also, our education is, to the last degree, insecure.\* What could possibly

---

tant clergy join the system generally, it may easily happen that Building Grants will again be accorded to schools, though not vested in the Board. They will probably join it; and for this reason alone, as well as for higher ones, we maintain that no rules are safe for the South which are not fit for the North also. *Our strength must be the strength that is in our principles.*

\* This theory seems to attribute to Parliament a mode of proceeding as unscrupulous as Archdeacon Stopford, in his Report of 1844, attributed to the National Board. He is surprised at such changes as he has described having been made while so little attention was attracted to them, and says, "It naturally leads one to consider how such great changes come to pass.....By what authority Lord Stanley's commission had been set aside. All these were matters of no small moment. 'Were we all asleep when all this was done?' is the thought that rises in every one's mind." (Report p. 38.) He accounts for the secrecy of the changes by a series of underhand proceedings deliberately planned by the Board, and executed with an entire disregard to the principles of honest dealing. "That deception which it is impossible to believe that the Board would have practised on the Lord Lieutenant, that very deception has been practised on Parliament and on the country." (Report p. 45.) Many pages are filled with the details of the proceedings which Archdeacon Stopford charges upon the Board, proceedings extending over a series of years, and affecting alike the government, the country, the Protestant clergy, and the Catholic

bring about such a conspiracy against the Irish people, on the part of those who are bound by duty, honour, and interest, to be their protectors? Obviously nothing but an ungovernable aversion to, and fear of, their religion. But we happen already to be largely in their power. If they cannot look on the great mass of our people otherwise than as religiously their enemies, they can only support the present National System so far as they consider it on the long run inimical to Catholicism. There are two modes of attack: that of storm and that of sap. The Church Missions prefer the former. This theory would suppose that others prefer the latter. The character of every system must depend mainly on the mode in which it is worked:—in the North, the predominant power, as regards the National System, is one divided between the landed proprietors, as patrons, and the State. Is the Hope of the peasant but as a fly caught between those two mailed hands? Yes, on this theory. If so, what follows, should we long retain the present system? Landlords frequently refuse sites even for National Schools if not Protestant in character. What is to prevent them from doing so always? Multitudes of Catholic national schools are consequently little better than hovels, leased from year to year. What is to prevent the Board from eventually refusing to give any aid, except where the school-house is such as we cannot make it? What is to prevent Model schools under the Board from being multiplied indefinitely, as the only alternatives to Non-vested schools under Protestant patrons? What is to prevent Model schools from establishing a latin class, and thus at once becoming intermediate schools? If a *bonâ fide* Catholic education for Catholics is indeed to be prevented, at any cost, our supposition is at least as natural as the one suggested to us. Our friendly monitors have thus succeeded in frightening us; but they have frightened us too much. They have convinced us that no system of education is safe which is administered by those who regard the recipients of it either as enemies, or as puppets. They have hinted that the remoter and more insidious danger may be the greater of the two. Passion is blind:

people. Those changes were all unfavourable to us; but we have referred them to no such base motives; and are equally unwilling to attribute evil designs to others.

Power is deaf: we cannot regard these as potentates fit to be entrusted finally with the education of our children. The argument that exhorts us not to leap down a precipice warns us also not to lie like Lotos-eaters upon a mud-bank before an advancing tide—and a mud-bank which is momentarily sinking beneath us. If there be such a thing as rashness, is there not also such a thing as a political Epicureanism contented to bear anything, whether of dishonour or of injury, so long as it is allowed to close its eyes to all dangers that are not in the immediate foreground? The warning we have alluded to is at least a conclusive argument to prove that a searching reform of existing abuses is necessary, if only to test the real dispositions of those who administer the National System. If, as it implies, the State considers us, not as it regards those whose education it aids in England, but simply as captives snared in its net, we ought to be made aware of the fact. We are unwilling to believe it. No doubt there were many who supported the "Catholic claims" merely because they fancied that Catholicism, as a religion, was dead. These persons, if consecutive, are of course aware that to repeal Catholic Emancipation is necessary before injustice can be pushed beyond a certain point. For our parts, we see something else in Ireland which would probably give way before the Act of 1829. But we cannot forget how many Protestants supported the Catholic claims, and made sacrifices for them, because they sincerely believed in the rights of conscience. These persons, at least, will sustain against unjust attack the rights they assisted us to win, and sustain them in their fulness.\* They may not understand our

---

\* Mr. Mac Ivor, who strongly asserts the rights of conscience, puts well the responsibility of those who, without wishing to do what is wrong, yet assist others to do it by co-operating with them in a *part* of their work. "You are not responsible either for the powers of nature, or the principles of the present British Constitution; but you are responsible for the part you act towards them, knowing them to be what they are, and being forewarned, and fully aware of the result which *will follow* from your voluntary proceeding." (The proposed Modification of the Non-vested System, p. 41.) Those who sanction Rules which easily lend themselves to abuses, sanction those abuses; for as Mr. Mac Ivor says, "If you know the nature of the weapon, and are aware of the consequences of what you do, you are responsible for those consequences, though you *only* load the gun," &c.



position in detail ; but they know generally that if we insist upon having for our children a system of education which will leave them Catholics and good Catholics, we are influenced by feelings exactly the same as those on which they act themselves every day. They must acknowledge that even when we cannot profit by their precept, we follow their example. Not only would they decline to send their children to Oscott or Stonyhurst, and that no matter what conditions might be made, or what material, or even moral, advantages might be held out to them there ; but they would refuse to send them to Eton or Oxford, if the books used there were largely imbued with a Catholic spirit ; if the teachers and the administration were predominately Catholic ; if Protestant pastors were warned off the premises ; if a nominal freedom were rendered nugatory by snares laid, or allowed to be laid, before the feet of unwary youth. What do we say ? Are there not already persons who fear to send their sons to the ancient and venerable Universities of their land, because of Tractarianism ?

It may be true that the more we endeavour to free ourselves from an unworthy and unsafe position, the more will some for whose rights we should have contended no less than for our own, endeavour to rivet our bonds. We shall, however, at least, know our friends from our enemies. The former will be fairly tested. With the latter, it can be no use to argue. They speak pretty plainly on the subject of idolatry, priestcraft, imposture, Babylon, and Antichrist. The land swarms with their Scripture readers, the lanes are littered with their tracts, and they receive, as they inform us, above £30,000 per annum from England, to assist their enterprises. They are often very amiable men ; and, but for this unhappy enthusiasm, would be useful, and deservedly popular, members of society in their respective parishes. They seem to us, when they take the line we allude to, very mischievous persons ; but what we regret about them chiefly is, that they are not Roman Catholics. Not being such, they see things from the particular level which they occupy on the Protestant ladder, and act accordingly. Their responsibility is chiefly as to the degree of sincerity, humility, and perseverance with which they have investigated the claims of that Church from which they still derive whatever they hold of Truth. We are bound to resist them : we have

neither the desire nor the right to judge them. The supporters of the Church Education Society, who have so long denounced the National System, are by no means, as they have recently informed the world, in favour of the Separate System! They mean apparently that they are contented with the Mixed System—provided they can have it all their own way. We cannot think that in this matter they have spoken quite candidly, or that they will be ultimately pleased with the line they have taken: but we are far from bearing them any ill will, and we hope that the creditable efforts which they have made to give their own children a religious education, directed by their *pastors*, may receive every assistance not injurious to the children of others. The State also, it is alleged, cannot trust us with the education of our children, except on condition that it is allowed to dilute the venom of our “ultramontaniam.” We regret this circumstance, and think the State, in this case, very unwise. It forfeits the advantages it would derive from an education which, just in proportion as it is religious, will inculcate obedience to rulers, in the only really efficient way, i. e., by promoting the virtues of reverence, humility, and self-restraint. Loyalty to the Sovereign we can teach, and shall continue to do so however we may be treated in this matter: the sense of Citizenship is, however, different from the loyal submission of Subjects, while both are necessary for the well-being of a State; and that noble sense it is not ours to bestow, because it proceeds from equal laws alone. We have much to be grateful for. The Penal Code has been repealed; and Catholic Emancipation has given to us equal civil rights. Two-thirds of the work has thus been done; but religious Equality we have not, and, so far as the law goes, religious Freedom is denied to us, especially by that recent law which, if it could have been carried out, would have reduced a Church fourteen hundred years old to the condition of some recent Japanese mission, under its vicars apostolical. It is exclusively in self-defence that we allude to this subject. We admit an evil, and we suggest a remedy. In the civil sphere, the white banner of Queen Victoria floats over us; in the ecclesiastical, the black banner of the Tudors. We have to live at once in the nineteenth century, and in the sixteenth; and our sympathies are, for that reason, not in entire unity. Our

position is far better than it was ; but it is less consistent. We are bound to remember that our chain is loosed ; the statesman is bound not to forget that the half-broken chain clanks the loudest, and sometimes galls the most. Let us hope that Parliament will not adopt the modern quack system of seeking a cure in drugs calculated to aggravate the disease. Ardently do we wish that there existed in Ireland the same reverence for law that is boasted of in England : but by the Englishman the law has for centuries been regarded as the champion of his liberty, and the mother of his prosperity and peace ; and it is because the Irishman shares the same human nature as his English brother that he can fully entertain the same feelings only under similar circumstances. They alone are citizens of "no mean city" who have the freedom of that city :—till lately we lived in a ghetto within its bounds, and we are still excluded from its chief temples and its ancient courts. Not only religious duty, but religious expediency binds us over to loyalty. The English constitution is largely derived from the old Catholic times ; and its happy union of order with liberty is the exact soil in which Catholicity can best grow. In England itself, therefore, and in every English colony, it flourishes daily more and more. It must have done so long since but for those accidents of the past which associated it in the minds of Englishmen with absolute government, and with foreign allies—the two worst friends any religion can have. When the last nail was driven into the coffin of the last Stuart, its new career began ; and, considering that it has only had a clear stage since 1829, it has run well. A clear stage, if little favour it possesses ; and the fall of the British empire would be the greatest calamity not only which civilization, but especially which Catholicism could possibly sustain. England has a storehouse of loyalty and citizenship near her, whenever she has wit to use it. Woe to the nation without Loyalty ; in such a nation there is no foundation for morals or for religion ! Woe to the laws which will not allow an unrestricted reverence for law to make Loyalty perfect in its union with perfect Citizenship ! We are loyal by duty and by interest ; but let us be pardoned if we decline to repose, relatively to our religious and educational affairs, an absolute trust in a State which does not care to conceal its distrust of us.

We trust that in so serious a question as education the

State may not act such a part as can only end in adding one more to the differences which already embitter our social relations. Statesmen have sometimes an "orthodoxy" of their own. Let them not, on this occasion, carry it so far as to substitute the dead bulk of Educational Uniformity for a national unity of heart and will. We trust that those who laugh at claims to infallibility, will not set up an educational infallibility, and enforce it by pains and penalties. "*Sint ut sunt, aut non sint*," may be a resolution fit for a Religious Order which has rooted itself in the heart of Christendom, and the branches of which spread over all nations; for such an institute may have already arrived at the conviction that it is not its preservation but its restoration, that it has to provide for. It is otherwise with institutions by necessity ephemeral in their character, and the highest praise of which is that they do good in their day, without impeding any higher good. There are many school systems, and none of them can boast an exclusive and absolute superiority. Their value depends largely on circumstances of time and place, which vary perpetually. The world has lived through centuries in which hardly any, except an elementary and purely religious education, was either possible or desirable. It is no less true that circumstances may be imagined under which, all instruction connected with religion being imparted in churches sufficiently numerous, that given in schools might be exclusively secular. There are countries the education of which is conducted to a large extent without schools, and in which the instructors are vagrant, lodged now here and now there, and teaching from house to house. It is in the definitions of Faith, not in the "letters of Cadmus," that certainty and stability are to be looked for. We beseech the State not to make broad its phylacteries, or uplift its prophet rod in a minatory hand, upon an occasion wholly unworthy of such high energies. It doubtless has its theories: so have we; but we are by no means fanatics in their favour, unless it be fanaticism to avoid known dangers, denounce proved abuses, request that we may enjoy either a just and fair "Mixed System," such as was originally founded in Ireland, or else such a "Denominational" System as exists in England, the colonies, and almost every highly civilized part of the world. The present system we obviously

cannot approve until we withdraw our gratitude from the Statesmen who introduced that of 1831. "Great principles" are not numerous: volumes were written, and speeches without end were made in their honour, before England had gained her present educational advantages, or conquered the perils by which she too was assailed. We are not going to invoke many of them. We have indicated but a few; and it can hardly be thought unreasonable if we desire at least to keep as near to these as is practicable. One of them is Freedom of Education—that the State should no more force its own educational, than its own religious theories, on its people, whether by direct force, or by indirect coercion. The second is correlative to this. It is that the people, in order that it may duly value education, should contribute, individually, the necessary funds so far as circumstances permit, and also bestow on it that individual attention which binds class to class.\* That the State,

---

\* This principle is repeatedly insisted upon by a great authority on education, and one to whom Ireland has much cause for gratitude, Sir Thomas Wyse. He maintained in one of his most celebrated speeches, (a) that it was of the essence of sound Education that, in carrying it out, the state and the people, should take respectively their proper parts. Government is to found schools; but then "every parish shall have power to assess itself for the support of any such schools;" (p. 7.) and again, speaking of County Academies, he says, "Upon the Government should devolve the duty of founding and outfitting; and upon the people that of maintaining them; and their management should be conducted jointly by the Government and the people; the first through the National Board, the latter through a County Committee." (p. 16.) Where the people thus tax themselves locally for education, they are likely, not only to value it, but to have some voice in determining its character. Where the Government undertakes to provide all, it rules all; and the people are reduced to a state of helpless dependance, like that of the city in Asia Minor, of old, upon which a conqueror imposed a penalty thought at first an indulgent one, viz., that its inhabitants should assume the long robe of an effeminate race hard by. In the same speech Sir Thomas Wyse gives a complete scheme of National Education. Provincial Colleges were a part of it; but there was another part of which we never hear

(a) Speech of Thomas Wyse, Esq., M.P., on Academical, Collegiate and University Education in Ireland; at the meeting held for that purpose at Cork, November 13th, 1844.

which has a vested interest in the knowledge and virtue of every subject and citizen, should have a large control in all that relates to the secular part of education, seems to us also as obvious, especially where the State contributes to education, as that the religious part should be directed by the pastors of each denomination—even of that one which is diffused throughout the world, and which imparted its faith to the British empire—so long as they enjoy the confidence of that denomination.

But should the State take in this matter ever so unwise a course, it has neither the power of making us truckle to injustice, nor that of forcing upon us any rash or ill-advised course in opposition to it. Successive governments have been the chief cause of that opposition which is now complained of, by allowing the National System to drift so far away from its original principles, thus sacrificing its friends to propitiate its enemies; and by persisting, during ten years, in an endeavour to force upon our people a collegiate education, regarded by them, and by their spiritual guides, as essentially irreligious. Ever since the famine years, the course of legislation has been such as to discourage a trust like that which existed when the National System was introduced. Emancipation had then been recently carried; and every session added to the list of liberal measures passed for Ireland. Neither the Repeal agitation, nor the feelings with which Mr. O'Connell was regarded in England, made anything like

---

now. Either Trinity College, Dublin, was to be thrown open upon entirely equal terms, to Catholics and Protestants; or else "a Catholic University should be founded, with all the dignities, emoluments and privileges, at present enjoyed by the Protestant University of Dublin." (p. 27.) This was asking something more than a charter! We need not point out how different must be the working of a half system and of a whole system. For the Provincial Colleges Sir Thomas preferred the "mixed" principle, supposing residence not to be a part of the plan. He also states however, that if "every individual were required to live within the walls, and to form, as it were, one family, particular doctrine, discipline, and practices of piety must exist, impossible to maintain, unless all the *alumni* were of the same religious faith." (p. 30-1.) These words describe exactly the conditions on which Training schools exist, and consequently, as we have urged, the principles on which they ought to be conducted.



a reactionary policy seem probable. For a dozen years—since the death of O'Connell and of Peel—things have gone on differently. We have seen nearly a whole session passed in legislation against a Hierarchy: we have doubted whether our convents would be left to us: Maynooth has been in far greater danger than it was before Parliament had taken a course which was to have secured it for ever: statesmen have shewn us that, if a popular cry arises, we are not always to rely upon them for meeting it with the voice of wisdom and tranquil might. The time for resenting these things has passed; but a lesson has been left behind, and neither conscience nor prudence allow us to neglect it. We seek nothing which is not for the interests of the State, and of all religious persuasions in the land, as well as for our own. The State would not, we imagine, gain if the Catholic Education of Ireland, like Ireland's Church, were ultimately to rest in a predominant degree, on the Voluntary principle. If it should be equally resolved not to reform the present system, and not to concede a different one, our course, even in such a case, need by no means produce a change so sudden as to involve anything like convulsion, disunion, or even pecuniary demands beyond our means.

It is by gradual, but resolute, efforts that really important objects are gained, not by spasmodic movements: and the pressure by which Catholic truth works its way is strong at once and gentle, like that of a pacific sea leaning against a bank. Educational movements especially, are not the work of a day, and this is one reason for not postponing them too long. Without a season of struggle, perhaps neither that strength nor that knowledge would be won but for which the best educational opportunities could not be turned to a right account. If the present system be not reformed it is stone by stone that the dangerous parts of the fabric must be taken down, the main walls being underpropped while a more solid masonry is rising up beneath them. We shall have to carry on operations at once within the system, and externally to it. It depends mainly on ourselves to *what extent* we choose to make use of the National System,—as it seems to us we have thrown too much of our weight upon it, using it as a crutch rather than as a walking staff, and suffered accordingly. We have it in our power, without infringing any rule of the system, or forfeiting any of its advantages,

to withdraw our children first from model schools; next from schools where religious instruction is given by a Protestant teacher only; next from other schools where, owing to the character of the patron, or to the circumstances of the neighbourhood, the faith of the child is insecure. Such a mode of proceeding would not necessarily affect the great bulk of our schools in the three southern provinces. But we shall effect nothing of permanent good unless the work of Construction accompanies, nay, in some cases, precedes that of Destruction.

Among the educational efforts required by the exigencies of the present time there are three which strike us as being of pre-eminent importance; and they have all of them this common characteristic, that their utility would be almost equally great whether the Mixed System continues to exist, or we have to achieve another. We want, in the first place, a Catholic Training School for our masters, and another for our mistresses, or rather we want several such. Not more than about half of our teachers are at present educated in the Training Schools in Marlborough street; and we have seen how unsatisfactory is the education there given. In England there are excellent Training Schools for school mistresses at the Convent at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, and that of the ladies of "Notre Dame" at Liverpool; the latter of which, especially, is so perfect that no one can inspect it without his ideas, as regards Catholic education, being enlarged and elevated. An admirable Training School for masters has been erected at Brook Green, Hammer-smith, with a garden of about two acres attached to it. Such institutions in Italy are, we believe, generally conducted by the great educational Order of St. Joseph Calasanctius, the introduction of which into this country could not but greatly increase the amount of that thoroughly religious education for which we are at present indebted, so far as boys are concerned, almost entirely to the Christian Brothers. The character of the master is more than half the battle in education: the question is not merely what he knows, nor what he can do, but what he is: the children soon come to understand him: he acts upon them, through their sympathies, with an influence almost magnetic. Schoolmasters cannot be made to order, nor cast in a mould; neither is there any mechanical agency by which they are enabled to mould their

pupils in the mass. It is individually that they are to be formed, and that not without very special aptitudes: on their pupils they have to act individually, for each of the latter has a character of his own; and they have to work through an influence vital and moral, and through a tact which requires large sympathies, a single purpose, and an unusual forgetfulness of self. The teachers once what they ought to be, the character of our existing National Schools would change very beneficially; and we should thus find the instruments without which high educational efforts can but end in disappointment. Some of our schoolmistresses are already trained by nuns. Why should not all of them be thus trained?

The second effort to which we have referred as necessary is the publication of books more fit than those now used for the education of Catholic children. The more elementary volumes published by the National Board are excellent, and even the more advanced contain much that is good; but they are singularly uncatholic in tone. They are also far too materialistic rightly to form the hearts and consciences of the young; and this becomes of the more importance from the place which they retain in the small cottage library. The scientific portion of them seems to us quite out of proportion to the rest, and very much less calculated to elevate and refine the being, both intellectual and moral, than much that might be substituted for it.\* The acts of the martyrs, the trials of early Christianity, the heroic legends that constitute the basis of history in almost every country, ballads which, without inflaming animosities, touch the spring of patriotic

---

\* The following remarks by the Rev. Derwent Coleridge are the result of long experience. "The excellence of such a school will be determined, not, I venture to urge, by the geography, or natural history, not by the penmanship, nor even by the arithmetic, but in the first place, and above all, by the READING.....if oral teaching be the first gate of knowledge, reading is the second—a magnificent portal, opening into the whole domain. . . . The favour shewn to geography as compared with history, is essentially a preference of the mechanical to the spiritual; and thus forms part of that system, or way of thinking, which attaches itself to sensible experience, to the comparative neglect of moral Truth. Against every indication of this spirit it is the duty of the religious educationist to enter his protest."

emotion—these things are surely more ennobling and more fit for a peasant's education than scraps of chemistry or the minuter geography and natural history of regions he is little likely to see. There are doubtless portions of our history which ought to be passed by or very lightly touched, but this is no reason for excluding other and earlier portions of it. Danté, describing the high and happy condition of Florence, before the tide of corruption had set in, tells us how the Florentine matron used to sit among her maidens spinning, and recounting to them

“Old tales of Troy, and Fiesole, and Rome.”

We cannot help thinking that a people that has lost this instinct, by which the imagination withdraws us from the despotism of the senses, and the past supersedes a too engrossing present, remains in a very barbarous state, whatever progress it may have made in empirical knowledge.

We should be sorry to depreciate science ; but its elevating influence is chiefly for those who have made considerable progress in it. Of course no scientific truths can ever be antagonistic to religious truths ; but certain habits of mind are accidentally antagonistic to other habits of mind ; and the primary object of education is to develop the most elevating intellectual habits, while it disciplines the moral and religious being ; not merely to impart a certain quantum of information, or to arm people for the secular struggles of life. Nothing is more common than to meet in our present schools young persons who can answer questions in Geography or Arithmetic with surprising quickness, and who yet could not read aloud the most touching narrative in such a way as to evince intelligence or to kindle sympathy in others. We have sometimes heard it remarked that the intellectual advance witnessed in Ireland since the introduction of the National System has by no means been accompanied by a corresponding moral and spiritual improvement ; nay, that in some respects the heart of the people is less sound than it was of old, and its spirit both less patient and less soaring. Such a remark is a severe charge against the present system ; as would also be the assertion that the Irish are as dependent now, as they were thirty years ago, upon State aid in Education. Before the books of the National Board had attained a sort of practical monopoly, owing to their

low price, and to their merit in many respects, a Catholic Book Society had begun a work the suspension of which is a great misfortune. The National Schools, if they have superseded what was worthless in the old Hedge Schools, have also put an end to a vast deal of classical education, which was at one time more common among the poor people of Ireland than among those of almost any other country, and which not only exercised a vivifying influence on the popular imagination, but assisted many young men in preparing for ecclesiastical seminaries. Materialism is, it must be remembered, the fault of our age, and one that would especially destroy everything beautiful in the Irish character. Take away from it, what time has spared and calamity has preserved, generosity, devotedness, purity, imaginative aspiration, a lively fancy, a light heart, and a simplicity of nature which, as in the case of children, is not destroyed even when united with overmuch subtlety, and, no matter how unshaken their orthodoxy may remain, the religious virtues will share the wreck. For such a loss neither wealth nor knowledge could make amends. The peasant's cottage might be better roofed, but its good angel would have departed. Complaining as we do of the utilitarian character of the National System, and thinking that an education which leans to art is far more calculated to brighten the peasant's hearth, and sweeten social life, than one which leans to science, it would be unfair to pass by without a word of gratitude the attention which, in several of its Model Schools, as well as in the Central Training Schools, that System has bestowed upon music. This good example should be imitated in all Catholic schools. Such books as we have suggested would also be among our first requisites if we had separate schools; while they would be no less important as part of a reform in the existing system. Supposing the Board fairly constituted, there is no reason why it should not sanction additional volumes, more in harmony than the present with the genius of the Irish people. Even as regards the religious element in those books no difficulty exists. There seems no more reason why extracts from Dr. Newman's and Dr. Manning's works, from Milner or Lingard, should not be admitted, than for the exclusion of Porteus and Taylor, and Whateley, of Hume and of Robertson; and we believe that the exquisite minstrelsies of Southwell, Crashaw, and Habington, are quite as fit for Catholic children as the hymns of Watts. Under the mixed sys-

tem there must of course be a great reserve as to dogma ; but if class-books are allowed, written in a very uncatholic spirit, but keeping clear from heterodox statements, there seems no reason why works written to the same extent in a Catholic spirit, and yet leaving Protestant opinions unassailed, should not be sanctioned also. The former class of works would probably continue to be used in Protestant National Schools—unless “High Church” principles should ever make way in Ireland. The latter would be used in schools frequented only by Catholics. In England there frequently exist, even in Protestant schools, books so Catholic that we could not complain of them.

Our third suggestion is the formation of a Catholic Educational Society. It should be composed of clergy and laity ; one of its advantages being that it would accustom these two classes to co-operate, not in any small or local matter, but on a field of labour as large as Ireland. It is through such a Society that both the enterprises we have just referred to, and several others hardly less useful, could best be carried out. It, too, would assist us equally in making the best of the Mixed System, or in substituting a Separate System for the present one. For the latter course, indeed, it would be an almost indispensable pre-requisite ; nor is it until the best energies of all our different classes, high and low, rich and poor, clerical and lay, have been trained to work together, that we can be adequately prepared to meet those practical difficulties which might, at first, oppose themselves to a System just in proportion as it was excellent in principle. Such a Society by its own organization would teach us Organization, the thing which we most stand in need of, and without which zeal lacks a sphere, and the most active exertions beat the air. In such a central Society schools under any unjust pressure would find at once the most experienced counsellor and the most efficient defender ; nay, its very existence would probably in many cases prevent aggression ; for it, too, would have its Inspection System, the vigilance of which could not easily be eluded. From it the districts which at present have no schools, or no safe schools, owing to extreme poverty, would find the supplementary aid they require. To it we should owe, ere long, Model Schools of a new sort, established successively, as fortresses of a Catholic education wherever the need for them was most urgent. Under its influence a school literature would spring up, uniting the



merits of those which belong to various countries; and Christian Art would be enabled to labour once more at her true vocation, the education of a people. Through it we should communicate both with England and the continent, thus escaping the chilling effects of isolation. Its Reports would extend our knowledge, increase our energies, and impart to the subject of education a dignity which would cause multitudes now apathetic to interest themselves in it. Its periodical meetings would concentrate our exertions, prevent the accumulation of abuses and keep us always on the advance. It should be supported by donations, bequests, annual subscriptions, and collections, the last of which would remind every peasant in the richer vales of Leinster and Munster that the outcast on the hills of Connaught, and the drudge in the manufacturing districts of Ulster, are his brothers; thus leading perhaps eventually to a Pastoral Aid Society, which would make the desert blossom and change to the most devout part of Ireland those districts which poverty and unjust laws have so long deprived almost of religious ministrations. Nearly all communities except our own possess such societies. In England what could have been done by the Established Church without the "National Society;"—and in this country how could Protestant education have made its cause good without the "Church Education Society?" Our fellow-countrymen and co-religionists in Great Britain, have shown us a good example; and to their "Poor School Committee," they owe chiefly the progress which Catholic education has made there of late years. That Society has served as their organ of communication with the State, has given them their training establishments, has largely aided the building of schools in all parts of England, has stimulated private efforts, put down proselytism, and raised the quality of education even more than it has increased it in quantity. Whenever we have such a Society in active operation we shall have been taught that best of all lessons—to help ourselves. No system of education which the most friendly of Governments could give us would work well if we threw ourselves upon its aid with the whole weight of helpless dependency. Till we have learned that our strength must be mainly from within, the system of education soundest and noblest in itself might be for us the most dangerous.

Such a Society as we have referred to would educate us into the right use of a sound educational system.

We cannot again be where we were before the late Pastoral. We must advance or recede. We have much cause for hope; but we should suffer equally from sloth, at such a period, and from any false move. The Parliamentary part of the struggle will be of little avail if we do nothing outside the walls of Parliament. Within those walls we earnestly hope that all the Catholic members will see the necessity of avoiding idle recriminations respecting points as to which they may differ. The end must be the same in all cases—a really sound system of Catholic Education. Towards this great common end all their efforts must be made to contribute, whether they seek it by the same means, or by two different, but not opposed, modes of operation. Within the last two or three days Mr. Cardwell's answer to the memorial of the Bishops has been published. It refuses to concede a separate system of Education: on the other hand, if there be meaning in words, it recognises the necessity of very important reforms in the present system. It distinctly and repeatedly refers to Mr. Stanley's Letter as the authoritative standard of the National System. It states that the principles of that letter *secure to the clergy their legitimate right of conveying religious instruction to the members of their respective churches.* It says, "I declare to you with equal plainness their (the Government's) desire to give full effect to that other principle of the system which provides for *separate religious teaching*, and respects, in the case of every child, the just authority of the parent." It engages to remove any just cause of complaint, as tested by *these principles*, and by the *Document* referred to as the exponent of the system. Our recapitulation of the changes which that system has undergone suffices to prove that such an engagement, if kept, involves both large and searching reforms.

---

We are sometimes asked to point out in detail the reforms needed by the present system in order to assimilate it, at least in spirit to that which was announced by Mr. Stanley's letter. The following list may be considered as an approximate answer to that question, provided it be understood that we neither assert the absolute necessity of every suggestion contained in it, nor deny the impor-

tance of other suggestions not included in it. It is hardly necessary to add that in this, as in all else, that regards a subject so momentous, we speak altogether in the way of suggestion, and with entire and unreserved submission to those to whom alone it is competent to decide with authority.

1. In the case of Vested Schools return to the two original principles both as to pastoral authority, and as to a "separate religious," as well as a "combined literary" education. Discard in these schools all books that do not respect this principle.

2. In the Non-vested Schools, if the State respects that later engagement unfortunately made, by which the Catholic Clergy may be excluded by Protestant Patrons, then, on the other hand, let Catholics be enabled to have efficient Non-vested Schools in the same localities by means of a law enabling Sites to be taken for Schools as they are for Coast-guard Stations;—those Sites to revert to the original Proprietors, if they cease to be used for the purposes of National Education.

3. In no school let the child receive religious instruction from a person whose Faith is different from that of the child's Parent, without that Parent's written consent.

4. The system of literary Model Schools should be gradually abandoned; and those that at present exist should be fairly distributed between the Catholic and Protestant bodies.

5. Non-vested Training Colleges should be established, either in place of, or in addition to, the present Central Training Schools; so that masters and mistresses in training shall have the advantage of a proper discipline, and shall receive their higher instruction from persons of their own Faith.

6. Additional books, compiled by Catholics, but not touching upon controverted points, should be sanctioned, when preferred, for the use of Schools under Catholic Patrons.

7. Patronage to be fairly administered. A Catholic Resident Commissioner:—an equal number of Catholics and Protestants at the Board; and a similar principle to be carried out in the Department of Inspection.

8. The Sign of the Cross to be permitted by the Board in all schools.

9. Either the Presbyterian Worship to be excluded, or else the Mass to be permitted in Non-vested Schools, and also the symbols of Catholic devotion. The Anglican worship to be similarly permitted on the same conditions.

10. Monastic Schools to receive grants on terms as favourable as those accorded to other Non-vested Schools.

11. Building Grants to be again given to schools though not vested in the Board.

So far as Protestant Non-vested Schools are concerned, if any further concessions can be made, calculated to improve the character of Protestant Education, without assailing the Faith of Catholic

children, we should rejoice to see them. It is with the proselytising zeal only, not with the religious interests of our Protestant fellow-countrymen, that we are at war. Under no Educational System can there be peace in Ireland until it is clearly understood that a System of Education supported by public funds must be, as regards religious contests, absolutely neutral ground. Polemical strife is an evil from which the training of the young ought to be kept sacred.

Since writing the above passages we have heard that the Church Education Society, with its 2500 Schools, has determined to join the National Board. There is an end then, if this be true, of the curious assumption that Catholics were to have the National System all to themselves in the South, and Protestants in the North. The system henceforth must stand on its merits; and its working must be determined by its Principles and its Rules, not by accidental circumstances. There are however, certain permanent and well known circumstances which must, unless corrected, make the same Rules assume a wholly different character, as regards different religious denominations. Those who so frequently remind us that the English system would work differently in England and in Ireland have penetration enough to see that the *non-vested* part of the National system, in which the religious instruction is at the disposal of the patron, must also work in the most opposite manner for those who possess wealth and lands, and for those who cannot even command a site for a school. If no legislative means be adopted to secure sites for Catholic as well as for Protestant Non-vested schools, the choice of the Catholic child in the latter will be that of either receiving Protestant religious instruction, or contenting himself with a merely secular education. The present system, it is true, does not take away the liberty of the subject; and out of school the child may go where he pleases: but few statesmen would affirm that the poorer part of our population can be expected to provide separate buildings and teachers in order to receive, out of school, that sacred portion of their education which is denied to them within it. We shall soon see with what degree of equal justice the State is prepared to hold up the balance of Education between those who frankly accepted the National system from the first, in spite of misgivings which they never concealed; who, with a credulous trust, allowed concession after concession to be made, of a character consistently unfavourable to them; who continued to support that system for a quarter of a century, though almost every one of their remonstrances, produced by its more dangerous alterations, was successively treated with disdain; whose patience seemed inexhaustible so long as any hope remained of the system being maintained upon the principles upon which it was introduced:—between this class of her majesty's subjects, and another which greeted the National system with every form of contumely; which continued for years, on the one hand to vilify it, on the other to

distort it by the changes their acute perseverance forced upon it ; and which joined it at last, in spite of a thousand conscientious protests, only when the completeness of those changes, and the permanent character attached to them by time, had fitted that system apparently to become the instrument of their will.

---

ART. IV.—*Ceylon : an Account of the Island—Physical, Historical, and Topographical ; with Notices of its Natural History, Antiquities, and Productions.* By Sir James Emerson Tennent, K.C.S., LL.D., &c. London : Longmans, 1859.

IT was once said, and with some show of reason, that every island in the world was claimed by Spain. England has done something better than claim the islands ; she has taken nearly every one of them, or such, at least, of them as were at all worth having. If there be any old ally, or old enemy of ours, Catholic, Protestant, Pagan, or Mus-sulman, that has not lost an island to us at one time or another, it is only because the fortunate state had not an island to lose. Spain, France, Holland, and Denmark, have been made to contribute alike to the extension of the British colonies ; and neither Catholic countries nor the natural enemies of England have had most reason to complain. Holland has been the greatest sufferer by far ; Holland, to whom Protestantism stands more deeply indebted than to any country in Europe, with perhaps the exception of Sweden ; and to whom English Protestantism is the most heavily in debt of all. Holland was to Protestantism in general not merely what the England of to-day is to political refugees, a shelter from pursuit ; she was a working and an active ally. Not only did she protect, comfort, and cherish the Protestant refugees from every part of Europe, but she took into her own hands the threads of their intrigues, and knotting them on to hers, she borrowed and repaid their strength. But she did infinitely more for England. It was in her bosom that the English revolution was contrived ; it was she who furnished to the revolution a king, an army, and a fleet. For this she was

requited in the way we all know ; and New York, New-Holland, the Cape, and Ceylon, are substantial evidences of British gratitude.

And it is not a little remarkable that England should be the only country at whose hands Holland has suffered any real, that is to say, any permanent loss. A comparatively good understanding was established between Spain and the revolted provinces, as soon as the latter had secured their independence ; nor do we find any very active hostilities between the two countries after the reign of Philip II. Louis XIV. defeated the Dutch in those famous campaigns, celebrated by Corneille in verses almost as wearisome as those of Addison upon the victories of Marlborough, and done into Latin of as drowsy an influence by the Père De la Rue. But Louis XIV. never crippled the strength or lowered the prestige of the United Provinces. Portugal was not a match for Holland, and never gained in her conflicts with that power ; but England, her natural ally, her adopted, and (shall it be said ?) her spoiled child, was the only state in Europe that plundered her, stripped her, and deposed her from her rank.

It is impossible to feel any degree of sympathy for Holland, and it is difficult to suppose that the instrument of her humiliation was not chosen with design. Dutch Protestantism is, or was, the most repulsive variety of the species. It is perhaps less gloomy, morose, and savage than that of Scotland ; and though equally cruel abroad, it never was quite so insolent and fanatical at home. Neither was it so insularly stiff, nor so dismal, at least upon Sundays, as the other ; but in its early period it was colder, craftier, and every way uglier than anything we read of elsewhere. But above all it was mean. Speaking generally, meanness is not the vice of Protestantism. A religion begotten in pride, and always asserting independence, although destined never to enjoy it, ought still to be free from the vice of meanness. And so it is with Protestantism generally. A Protestant who in practice as in theory sets faith above works, and sins that grace may abound, is of course the most independent man alive ; but even he whose thoughts do not range the breadth of one idea beyond the nasal teaching of his minister, believes that he is free and independent, and certainly does gain in spirit and bearing by his belief. The Anglican who is fettered by articles, and homilies, and formularies, and



canons, and church discipline acts, and decisions of the Court of Arches, and more than all, by traditions under which he chafes but from which he cannot escape; he too, believes that he is independent, and he is therefore straight and proud. The Presbyterian who swears by the Westminster Catechism, and excommunicates any brother who presumes to think differently, is perfectly unconscious of subjection, and believes that he is free, with a faith as undoubting as that of the hypochondriac who believes he is a tea-pot. In a worldly sense, this Protestant delusion is at least a generous one, and will not engender meanness. The Huguenots were gallant soldiers and gentlemen of honour. The parliamentary saints of England carried their round heads upon stiff necks; and the Swedes of Gustavus and Charles were a splendid military race; but the Dutch, although they certainly did not lose the fighting qualities that won their independence, seem to have acquired, or to have had developed along with their Protestantism, a meanness quite unknown to independent nations. Where they forbore to persecute, their forbearance was gainful; when they did persecute, toleration would have been unprofitable. In the courts of the heathen their spirit was that of a bag-man soliciting orders, and they oppressed their Catholic countrymen at home with no greater fanaticism than that of a bill discounter. "What was not provided for by the constitutions of their government," says Sir William Temple, "was so in a very great degree by the connivance of their officers, who *upon certain constant payments from every family*, suffer the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion in their several jurisdictions, as free and easie, though not *so cheap* and so avowed as the rest."

Hence there are few Protestant writers above the level of Mr. Tresham Gregg or Dr. Cumming, who are not forward to condemn the part taken by the Dutch against the Japanese Christians, and the profanation of the cross which, until within the last few years, they willingly committed as the price of their permission to trade with Japan. Even those Protestants who have no particular respect for the cross, and have perhaps rather an aversion to it, would hesitate to set their feet upon the symbol of redemption,

---

\* Temple's Works, vol. i. p. 58.

well knowing that in the eyes of the Japanese, as of the world generally, the cross is the symbol of Christianity, and that those who trample upon the one are understood to abjure the other. And doubtless there are many whom even this consideration would not deter from so odious an offence, and who would yet be revolted by its meanness. But the Dutch were never known to be affected by scruples, whether of religion or of honour. Religion they conceived was a good thing in its kind and place. The church was the place for religion, as the bed for sleep, or the dining-room for eating. But they never would permit it to interfere in the ordinary concerns of life. Their business in this world was to buy and sell, and if it might be, to outwit and to cheat.

"Mammon led them on,  
Mammon, the least erected spirit that fell  
From heav'n, for e'en in heav'n his looks and thoughts  
Were always downward bent, admiring more  
The riches of heav'n's pavement-trodden gold  
Than ought divine or holy else enjoyed  
In vision beatific."

The island which is the subject of Sir Emerson Tennent's book, was perhaps the most valuable possession of the Dutch republic, although not turned to the greatest account. Its natural wealth would seem to be almost unlimited, so far as it has been yet discovered, and we may well suppose that a country which includes a mountain range of the mean height of the Pyrenees, cannot but conceal mineral treasures which will yet be the reward of enterprise. The island, with an area not larger than that of Ireland, includes almost every variety of surface and of soil, with, however, but few varieties of climate. Some of its natural productions once amongst the principal sources of wealth, must disappear before long in the ordinary course of civilization. As soon as the forests, the "*stabula alta ferarum*," shall have been cleared, there will be as complete an end of the renowned elephants of Ceylon, as is sometimes made of the peasantry in another island, by an improving landlord under her Majesty's writ of "*Habere facias possessionem*." For many years past the elephant, as an article of commerce, whether for its ivory or for its service, has ceased to maintain its earlier value. The colonial government, indeed,

has largely availed itself of the strength and sagacity of the elephant, in the prosecution of great public works, and especially in the formation of roads, which are the elements of modern civilization. The elephant, according to Sir Emerson Tennent's account, would seem to be as kindly treated, and as well cared for, as any other servant of man; but, like other servants, his work is often too much for him, and whether as a result of the fatigues undergone in the course of his capture, or whether it be from some constitutional peculiarity, or, again, from a broken heart, as the natives say, the elephant does often die suddenly in the first month, or even the first week of his service. The government stud, therefore, requires to be recruited from the jungle by captures upon the large scale described by Sir Emerson, while in addition to this, private hunters pursue the elephants for the sake of game, and they are murdered by civilized Englishmen in the name of sport. It is by their effective services upon the roads, however, that they most contribute to the destruction of their race; for, every mile of road encroaches on their pastures, and pushes them out into the fatal air of civilization. It is almost the case of Charles I., upon whom parliament levied war in his own name. But at all events the elephants are near their end, and if they last until the roads are all made, government will be thankful, and make no complaints. But, meanwhile, other sources of riches are being rapidly developed. The cocoa nut, the cinnamon tree, and the lately introduced coffee plant, with an endless variety of native tropical fruits and spices, are daily becoming more valuable. The reconstruction of the ancient tanks, and the use of an improved system of irrigation, will make the rice grounds what they were in the early days of Singhalese prosperity, and the whole will suffice not only for the purposes of distant commerce, but for the support of a great population at home.

The ruins of cities and temples, but above all, the dilapidated tanks or artificial basins, would argue a very high degree of civilization in ancient Ceylon, if we were left to inference. Indeed, an argument of civilization, founded upon the existence of monuments such as we find in Ceylon, could hardly be called inference in the ordinary sense of the word, for it amounts to evidence. But concurrently with those monuments, we have a more or

less authentic history of Ceylon, covering a space of more than two thousand years, which, even without the monuments, would prove the existence of an extinct civilization. And when the Singhalese history is alluded to as more or less authentic, the term must be considered as applying to some only of the facts which seem to border on the fabulous, or are liable to the same misrepresentations as occur in any European history. The work itself is undoubtedly genuine, although so long neglected by the learned in Europe. Like Greek or Roman history, it contains an admixture of mere fable, but it seems to be as faithfully a book as you find in the run of histories, and it sometimes gives catalogues of facts and names too dry not to be perfectly true.

Coupling all that is told us in the history with the evidence of the monuments, and especially of the tanks, which are quite as wonderful in their way as the Roman aqueducts, it cannot be doubted that the island must have supported some ten or twelve millions of inhabitants. Were we to understand the native annals literally, the number was much greater. But making every possible allowance for exaggeration, a thing so common in dealing with numbers, and particularly with round numbers, the population must have been great, and if considered with reference to the available area of the island, extraordinary. If we deduct from the entire area, the mountain ranges, which were either inaccessible or unprofitable, and the vast tracts of forest that supplied pasture to the elephants, and the great area that was enclosed in the tanks and artificial or natural watercourses, and also the quantity of land that required to be submerged for the cultivation of rice; the ten or twelve millions who may, without exaggeration, be supposed to have inhabited the remainder of the island, must have been closely packed. The civilization that existed at the time was, it hardly requires to be said, something very different from modern, and still more from Christian civilization, for unfortunately there is too often a distinction between the two. In the mechanical and decorative arts, however, which many seem to identify with civilization, the Singhalese do not seem to have been more backward than any nation of the east. Their architecture, it is true, did not conform to our standard of taste, which is usually borrowed from the Greek models; and their ornamentation was of that profuse and

elaborate kind which has been called barbaric; but if high civilization involve what is somewhat arbitrarily deemed correct taste, England must be the least civilized country in Europe.

Sir Emerson Tennent leaves little unsaid about Ceylon that can be crowded, without confusion, into the limits of a readable book; and the book, it must be said, is very readable. The two volumes of the work include what is a good deal more than a summary of the political history of Ceylon, up to the appearance of the Portuguese; and thenceforth a detailed history of the country during the Portuguese and Dutch settlements, and of the annexation of the island to the British empire. The physical and topographical description of Ceylon is as interesting as the historical account, and perhaps even more complete. In fact the difficulty would be to say what it has left out. The hybernation of bears, and the æstivation of fishes; the polity of the white ants in their limited monarchy, and an inquiry into the habits of the elephant, with a special view to the vindication of his character; the transformations of the coffee-bug, the analysis of the serpent stone, and the anatomy of the land leech; the sacred Bo-tree of Anaragapoorah, and the theory of Betel chewing; the parasite of the bat, and the Maha-pus-wail, or great hollow climber; everything, in fact, belonging to Ceylon in the animal and vegetable reign, may be found in Sir Emerson's wonderful volumes. That the account is interesting every one can witness; that it is clear, well arranged, and not wanting in descriptive power, is equally true; and that the author relies upon numerous authorities, and holds them responsible, may be seen by a glance at the foot of the page; but whether on the whole this portion of the work is accurate and faithful, whether Sir Emerson's volumes will serve as books of reference, and whether, as one of his critics has said, "They will be valued by all serious students in proportion to the study and the trouble they save;" are questions which it will take time to determine. It is certain that some of his statements are questioned, and some positively denied. At all events he is probably not more inaccurate as a natural historian, than was Goldsmith; and who will say that he is not as amusing?

These remarks, if they apply at all, will apply only to what Sir Emerson has stated upon the authority of others;

and, whether his accounts be quite according to the fact or otherwise, the book is a surprising performance ; for the author has written with great clearness, order, and descriptive power, upon scientific matters, embarrassed by hard and obscure terms of art, with which, from his general pursuits, we cannot suppose him to have had more than a very superficial acquaintance at the utmost. Less, than a lifetime of study would hardly qualify any man but a Humboldt to write upon even one of the subjects of natural history which Sir Emerson Tennent has included in his work : but where anything has fallen under his own observation, we are quite willing to admit his facts, with every prudent reserve as to the references.

The most valuable portion of the work, in every respect, is that which deals with the political history of Ceylon ; and, over and above the information which Sir Emerson Tennent has extracted for us from the native annals, he has been enabled, by his own observation, to confirm, in numerous interesting particulars, the accounts of Ceylon, which we derive from the earliest as well as from the more modern Greek and Latin writers, who have touched upon the subject. With the exception of one who had been detained in captivity by the Singhalese King for years, but without any circumstances of cruelty or ill treatment, and exactly as Knox had been detained many centuries later, none of those writers had, like Sir Emerson, the advantage of personal observation. That of the captives was naturally very limited, but such as it was, we have been allowed the benefit of it. The other writers who mentioned Ceylon, had their accounts of it second hand, and their writings are consequently full of fable and exaggeration. They have assigned to it, three times, and four times its actual extent, and have embellished their descriptions with numerous fictions, upon which they may or may not have themselves improved. Herodotus most probably had his accounts of the wonderful Persian ants, "smaller than dogs but larger than foxes," from honest Greek tars, who could spin a yarn as well as any British tar alive. The Cynocephali and the Sciapodes of Aristophanes, belonged, we may suppose, to the same family ; but no one doubts that there is a great deal of substantial history in the books of Herodotus. Ceylon first became known to the Greeks, as far as we can ascertain, about the time of Alexander, and is first noticed by Strabo, under the



name of Taprobane, a name which it retained long after the embassy of the Singhalese to the Emperor Claudius, and about the etymology of which—

*Grammatici certant et adhuc sub judice lis est.*

In the Chinese Annals, however, much earlier mention is made of it, and Sir Emerson Tennent seems to have convinced himself that the Harbour of Point de Galle is the Tarshish of Scripture. His arguments are plausible to say the least, and we, for our own part, can see no reason why it should not be; but although we have no proof of much that has been written by the ancients regarding Ceylon, a great deal also derives confirmation from the Singhalese books, and from the experience of Europeans since the date of the Portuguese settlement. Amongst the most remarkable of Singhalese habits noticed by the ancients, and still preserved, is the habit of drawing the bow with the foot, observable amongst the Veddahs; and the practice, still in full vigour with the men generally, of wearing long hair, which they confine with combs and hair pins, exactly after the fashion of women. Their jealousy of foreign intrusion also, is noticed as well by the Chinese, as by the Greeks, although in the end, it availed the inhabitants of Ceylon as little as it is likely to avail the Chinese or Japanese. But, the closeness of those nations might be called hospitality and unguardedness, in comparison with the reserve of the Singhalese; a reserve which is still maintained by some of the aboriginal tribes. Unlike the Chinese, they held no intercourse, however cautious or guarded, with a stranger. They never suffered themselves to be seen, but exposed their wares for sale, with some conventional mark of a price affixed, as Chinese writers have stated, and as the Singhalese ambassadors themselves informed the Emperor Claudius. If the wares pleased the stranger, he took them with him and deposited the price; a practice which is observed at the present day in every particular by some of the tribes of the interior, in their dealings with the other races.

To this mysterious secrecy, and to the practice of detaining in captivity, the luckless stranger who, for any purpose whatever, should have roamed somewhat inland, may be ascribed the fables which prevailed amongst the Chinese, relative to the inhabitants of Ceylon, and which

have a strong family resemblance to the classic stories of the Sirens, the Lotophagi, and Lestrigonians. The stories of the Chinese describe Ceylon as inhabited by she-devils of exceeding beauty, whose practice it was to decoy the merchants who travelled those seas, and then to eat them up without mercy. Sir Emerson Tennent copies the account from a French translation of Hionen Thsang, a Chinese Buddhist of the seventh century. "Elles épiaient constamment les marchands qui abordaient dans l'isle, et se changeant en femmes d'une grande beauté, elles venaient audevant d'eux avec des fleurs odorantes, et au son des instruments de musique, leur adressaient des paroles bienveillantes et les attiraient dans la ville de fer. Alors elles leur offraient un joyeux festin, et se livraient au plaisir avec eux : puis elles les enfermaient dans un prison de fer, et les mangeaient l'un après l'autre." But a coincidence more singular still is to find the story of Circe and Ulysses, reproduced in the "Mahawanso," or legendary history of the Bengalee dynasty of Ceylon. In this story, the founder of the dynasty, Prince Wijayo plays the part of Ulysses ; and a native princess, not a goddess, however, but a magician, like Armida, is the Singhalese Circe. Sir Emerson Tennent finds it difficult to imagine that the Singhalese chronicler had not some knowledge of Homer ; and our principal reason for supposing that he had not, is the poor account to which, in that case, he would have turned his knowledge in the construction of the fable. There is no doubt a striking similarity approaching to identity between the two stories ; but the most beautiful incidents in the story of Ulysses, are left out in the adventure of Wijayo. We cannot suppose the writer of the Mahawanso to have been deterred by conscientious scruples or by fear of detection, from appropriating the whole of the adventure, if he did in fact appropriate so very large a portion of it. And indeed Sir Emerson Tennent qualifies his theory of the Homeric scholarship of the Mahawanso, by saying, that, remnants only of the original story had reached the compiler after having been passed from hand to hand by successive story tellers. The resemblance, however, between the Homeric and the Singhalese legend, is so curious that the passage is worth extracting ; and perhaps it is not least so on account of the *dissimilarity*. Ulysses is never more thoroughly the gentleman, the orator, the diplomatist, and the king, than in his encounter with Circe. If he does resort to the rather

ungallant proceeding of drawing his sword upon a lady, it is merely as part of a spell and in compliance with superior orders: he means no harm, and it is the exception to his uniform course. Both before and afterwards, he is perfectly deferential to the goddess; and in his plea on behalf of his unfortunate companions, he is the same gently persuasive orator we have always known; while his delight upon recovering his companions, is enough to move even the stern Circe. Wijayo is a hero of quite a different stamp. He draws his sword like a militiaman in a tap; and when he catches the lady by the hair he means real mischief.

"Wijayo and his followers, having made good their landing, are met by a *devo* (a divine spirit,) who blesses them, and ties a sacred thread as a charm on the arm of each. One of the band presently discovers the Princess in the person of a devotee, seated near a tank, and she being a magician (Yakkini) imprisons him, and eventually the rest of his companions, in a cave. The *Mahawanso* then proceeds: 'All these persons not returning, Wijayo, becoming alarmed, equipping himself with the five weapons of war, proceeded after them, and examined the delightful pond. He could perceive no footsteps but those leading down into it, and there he saw the Princess. It occurred to him his retinue must surely have been seized by her, and he exclaimed, 'Pray, why dost not thou produce my attendants?' 'Prince,' she replied, 'from attendants what pleasure caust thou derive? Drink and bathe ere thou departest.' Seizing her by the hair with his left hand, whilst with his right he raised his sword, he exclaimed, 'Slave, deliver my followers or die.' The Yakkini, terrified, implored for her life. 'Spare me, Prince, and on thee will I bestow sovereignty, my love, and my service.' In order that he might not be again involved in difficulty he forced her to swear, and when he again demanded the liberation of his attendants she brought them forth, and declaring 'these men must be famishing,' she distributed to them rice, and other articles procured from the wrecked ships of mariners who had fallen a prey to her. A feast follows, and Wijayo and the Princess retire to pass the night in an apartment which she causes to spring up at the foot of a tree, curtained as with a wall and fragrant with incense."

Long before the arrival of the Portuguese, Ceylon had been falling into that state which is the sure forerunner of national extinction, when it follows upon a long course of prosperity, and by which, foreign conquerors are attracted as certainly as the vulture to the carcass. Every province has now its own king, and all the kings are at war with

each other. Foreign mercenaries summoned to the aid of this king, or of that, find it profitable to make war upon their own account, and then to be bought off. According as the central power grows weaker, the petty kings are driven to share their authority with influential feudatories, who fight for their immediate lord when it suits their convenience, and fight against him on the same principle, just as the great barons had been used to do in Europe. All the while, cities are sacked and desolated, fields are ravaged, farm-steads and villages with their inhabitants disappear, rice grounds fall back into swamp and jungle, the tanks are wantonly broken or become dilapidated by neglect; and everything betokened the rapid decay and proximate subjection of Ceylon, when the first Portuguese ship makes its appearance in the offing.

The Portuguese settlement began according to the usual precedent in such cases. The Portuguese first obtained liberty to establish a factory for the innocent purposes of trade. It then became necessary to place the factory in a state of defence, against marauders merely, but by no means against the sovereign authorities of the country, by whose permission the factory stood there. The factory soon expanded into a fort, mounting heavy guns, of which the Singhalese had hitherto known nothing. By and by the kings of Cotta, who had the nominal sovereignty of the island, came to think that the Portuguese might be turned to account in disturbing the balance of power. In due course the Portuguese were taken into the service of the king. Their fort grew into a town; they fought his battles for him, and as a natural result provoked his jealousy. Meanwhile the Singhalese had learned the use of firearms, and the Portuguese had now to fight against the king as well as for him. The wars between the Portuguese and the Islanders were stained by cruelties unknown to civilised warfare, as might have been expected, and as always happens where one of the belligerents is unacquainted with the laws that in some degree mitigate the inevitable horrors of war. Treachery upon the one side is followed by retaliation upon the other, and so begins the series of reprisals, which go on perpetually increasing their atrocity. At length a king of Cotta bequeathed his kingdom to the crown of Portugal, whose claims thenceforward assumed a colour of legitimacy; but during the entire period of the Portuguese occupation, the

intervals of peace were extremely few ; and although Portuguese discipline generally prevailed, it very often met with reverses. It must be said, too, that treacherous massacres of the Portuguese by the natives are features of very frequent recurrence throughout the history of those wars, whereas we rarely find the former defeated in fair battle ; and it also appears that their cruelties, however odious and indefensible, were usually perpetrated in heat of blood, and during the fight or immediately afterwards.

Side by side with this struggle for dominion, another movement was going on, of which alone, the Portuguese have no reason to be ashamed. They openly professed that the exaltation of the faith was the main, if not the sole, object of their conquests, and we cannot doubt that it was one of their paramount objects. Their policy in other particulars was too often of a kind to defeat their hopes and labours in this respect ; but that the exaltation and spread of the faith was a great and uniform feature of their general policy is quite certain. During the brief intervals of peace which occurred throughout the occupation, they promoted this object with all their might. Nothing that missionary labour could effect for the conversion of the natives, was left undone ; and whenever the Portuguese formed an alliance with any of the Singhalese princes, they always stipulated for liberty to preach Christianity. The Singhalese were amongst the earliest disciples of St. Francis Xavier's companions ; and although the Rajah of Jaffnapatam afterwards murdered six hundred of their converts, he by no means succeeded in exterminating Christianity. The king of Candy at one time invited the missionaries and at another he expelled them ; a son of one of the kings of Cotta was baptised in Lisbon, and from time to time a king of Cotta and various members of the royal family became Christians. One of the most powerful and able of these princes apostatized, and the action of the missionaries was in this way extensively thwarted, interrupted, and again resumed ; but when the Portuguese dominion was brought to a close by the issue of the war with the Dutch, the conquests which they had won for religion survived the loss of their territory, and as Sir Emerson Tennent bears witness, the religion which they planted is still propagating its boundaries and enlarging its influence.

Sir Emerson Tennent, more it appears to us from a

fashion of speaking, than from a habit of thought, in many places treats the religious policy of the Portuguese as fanaticism; but whenever he come to reason deliberately and to state facts, he curiously disproves his own assertions. We had occasion to advert to this circumstance some years ago in our notice of his book upon Christianity in Ceylon, which it seems had been intended by the author to form part of the present work. It is not unlikely that Sir Emerson Tennent has worked off even since then some of the prejudices which still seem to cling to him. We know that his expanding liberality has earned for him something very like a strong dislike from his old friends in Belfast, who, notwithstanding their superior Christianity, are rather good haters. He ventured, we believe, on one occasion, to hint to them that no one can make a clear escape from the atmosphere of Belfast without leaving most of his Belfast prejudices behind, and we hardly think he will improve in the esteem of revived Christianity after having lived in a place so far beyond the range of its influences as the island of Ceylon. Sir Emerson Tennent is certainly not to be claimed as an admirer of Catholicity in any of its aspects, but it is something to find a man who will not twist a plain fact, because perhaps he might like it to be otherwise, and who will give you the benefit of his experience, to make what use of it you may think best, although it may convey to him a very different lesson from that which it conveys to you, and from that which he might wish it to convey.

The Dutch, after an occupation of almost equal length with that of the Portuguese, have left behind them no traditions but those of contempt. Their descendants retain little of the original Dutch settlers but their names. The language and religion of Holland have all but completely disappeared from the island. Their first league, which resulted in the expulsion of the Portuguese, was with one of the most haughty, suspicious, and treacherous of the native tyrants, Rajah Singha II. The Portuguese never forfeited the respect of the natives by one act of meanness, during the entire period of their rule. Their conceptions were grand, the execution of them daring. They were an army of gentlemen and heroes. If they had the ambition and the cruelty of kings, they had whatever of nobleness belongs to kings, or is ascribed to them. Although they lusted for dominion, they were ready to sacrifice every-



thing for religion ; and the magnificence of Constantine Braganza, who refused countless treasures rather than surrender the sacred tooth to the idolatry of Pegu, contrasted favourably with the meanness of the Dutch, who would themselves have worshipped the sacred tooth for a valuable consideration.

"The Viceroy called on the treasurer to produce the tooth. He handed it to the archbishop, who in their presence placed it in a mortar, and with his own hand reducing it to powder, cast the pieces into a brazier, which stood ready for the purpose ; after which, the ashes and the charcoal together were cast into the river in sight of all, they crowding to the verandahs and windows which looked upon the water.

"Many protested against this measure of the Viceroy, since there was nothing to prevent the Buddhists from making other idols ; and out of a piece of bone they could shape another tooth in resemblance of the one they had lost, and extend to it the same worship ; whilst the gold that had been rejected would have repaired the pressing necessities of the State. In Portugal itself much astonishment was expressed that these proceedings should have been assented to.

"To commemorate the event, and to illustrate the spirit which had dictated an act approved by the Fathers of the Company, and signalized by zeal for Christianity and the glory of God, a device was designed as follows : On an escutcheon was a representation of the Viceroy and the Archbishop surrounded by the prelates, monks, and divines who had been present on the occasion, and in the midst was the burning brazier, together with Buddhists offering purses of money. Above, the letter C, being the initial of Don Constantine, was repeated five times, thus—

C. C. C. C. C.

And below it the five words,

*Constantinus cœli cupidine crumenas cremavit.*

The interpretation being that 'Constantine, devoted to heaven, rejected the treasures of earth.'

Exasperated as were the Singhalese at the rapacity, cruelty, and ambition of the Portuguese settlers, they did not fail to recognize and admire whatever was great and noble in the Portuguese character. The language as well as the religion of Portugal had made rapid progress amongst them before the arrival of the Dutch, and the proudest chiefs were ambitious of the title of Don, with a Portuguese Christian name, which many of them continued to bear even after their relapse into Buddhism. The

ascendancy of the Portuguese language is not yet destroyed, and that of the religion is still on the increase. This, if anything, ought to be a decisive test of the comparative merit of the Portuguese and Dutch policy. Sir Emerson Tennent has made the comparison in two or three places.

"The fanatical zeal of the Roman Catholic Sovereigns for the propagation of the faith, was replaced by the earnest toil of Dutch traders to entrench their trading monopolies; and the almost chivalrous energy with which the soldiers of Portugal resented or resisted the attacks of the native princes, was exchanged for the subdued humbleness with which the merchants of Holland endured the insults and outrages perpetrated by the tyrants of Kandy upon their envoys and officers. The maintenance of peace was so essential to the extension of commerce, that no provocation, however gross, was sufficient to rouse them to retaliation, provided the offence was individual or local, and did not interrupt the routine of business at their factories on the coast.

"The unworthiness of such a policy was perceptible even to the instincts of the barbarians, with whom they had to deal, and Raja Singha II., by the arrogance and contempt of his demeanour and intercourse, attested the scorn with which he endured the presence of the faithless intruders whom he was powerless to expel.

"He disregarded all engagements, violated all treaties, laid waste the Dutch territory, and put their subjects to the sword; yet in spite of these atrocities, they addressed him with adulation, whilst he replied with studied contumely, and persisted in sending him embassies and presents, although he repelled their advances, and imprisoned and even executed their ambassadors."

But we were hardly prepared to find the Dutch outdone in the national vice of meanness by Englishmen, proud imperial Englishmen, Englishmen of the old Roman type, Britons who never never would be slaves. Instance the following passage:—

"It is to be regretted that the postponement of national honour to commercial advantages, was not confined to Holland in the east; and the observance of the same humiliating policy, is to be found on a still greater scale in the early intercourse of the British East India Company with the Emperor of Delhi.

"There is nothing in the records of the Dutch more disgraceful than those official documents of the English in India at the beginning of the last century, who, in the name of 'God,' laid at the feet of the Great Mogul, *'The supplication of the Governor of Bengal, whose forehead is his footstool,'* setting out *'that the Englishmen trading to Bengal are his Majesty's slaves, always intent upon doing his com-*

*mands, and having readily obeyed his most sacred orders, have therefore found favour,' and they 'crave, as his servants, a firman for trade, and protection to follow their business without molestation.' Letter of Governor Russell, 15 September, 1712."*

The slaves of the great Mogul, and the governors whose foreheads were his footstool, have indemnified themselves pretty largely, it must be admitted, for this worse than Dutch humiliation. They soon contrived to change places with the Emperor of Delhi; and we are not surprised to find them assume a perfectly dignified and lofty tone towards the Emperor, when they spoke from his palace after having appropriated his dominions. This much, however, may be said for the Englishmen trading to Bengal, that their meanness was un-English and exceptional, whereas the meanness of the Dutch was perfectly national and consistent.

Nor does it seem that the benefit of the population under their governments entered into the views of the Dutch.

"Throughout all the records which the Dutch have left us of their policy in Ceylon, it is painfully observable that no disinterested concern is manifested, and no measures directed for the elevation and happiness of the native population; and even where care is shown to have been bestowed upon the spread of education and religion, motives are apparent, either latent or avowed, which detract from the grace and generosity of the act. Thus, schools were freely established, but their avowed object was to wean the young Singhalese from their allegiance to the Emperor, and the better to impress them with the power and ascendancy of Holland. Churches were built because the extension of the Protestant faith was likely to counteract the influence of the Portuguese Roman Catholics, and the spread of Christianity, to discourage the Moors and Mahometan traders."

The comparative results of the Portuguese and Dutch policy, are thus summed up by Sir Emerson Tennent.

"The dominion of the Netherlands in Ceylon, was nearly equal in duration with that of Portugal, about one hundred and forty years; but the policies of the two countries have left a very different impress upon the character and institutions of the people amongst whom they lived. The most important bequest left by the utilitarian genius of Holland, is the code of Roman Dutch laws, which still prevails in the supreme courts of justice; whilst the fanatical propagandism of the Portuguese, has reared for itself a monument,

in the abiding and expanding influence of the Roman Catholic faith. This flourishes in every province and hamlet where it was implanted by the Franciscans, whilst the doctrines of the reformed Church of Holland, never preached beyond the walls of the fortresses, are now extinct throughout the island, with the exception of an expiring community at Colombo. Already the language of the Dutch which they sought to extend by penal enactments, has ceased to be spoken even by their direct descendants, whilst to the present day, a corrupted Portuguese is the vernacular of the middle classes, in every town of importance. As the practical government of the Netherlands only recognised the interests of the native population, in so far as they were essential to uphold their trading monopolies, their memory was recalled by no agreeable associations; whilst the Portuguese, who, in spite of their cruelties, were identified with the people by a common faith, excited a feeling of admiration by the boldness of their conflicts with the Kandyans, and the chivalrous though ineffectual defence of their beleaguered fortresses. The Dutch and their proceedings have almost ceased to be remembered by the Lowland Singhalese, but the chiefs of the south and west, perpetuate with pride, the honorific title of *Don*, accorded to them by their first European conquerors, and still prefix to their ancient patronymics, the sonorous Christian names of the Portuguese."

The Dutch Calvinists, as we have observed, subjected their Catholic countrymen, who were rather more than a third of the entire population of the Netherlands, to a comparatively mild, and to them, the Calvinists, a gainful persecution. Why slay them, banish them, or beggar them after the manner of the English Protestants? The Dutch Catholics were quiet people, well to do, and willing to pay for toleration; perhaps not unprepared to fight if driven to despair. To kill them would be like killing the hen that laid the golden eggs; to provoke them beyond all endurance would not be wise; and their high mightinesses never thought of anything so absurd. As soon as the provinces were declared independent, and the new religion having lost the charm of outlawry, became a respectable but common-place member of society, the republic took pleasure in the reformed faith, but without a touch of enthusiasm. The Dutchman liked his religion pretty much as he liked his vrow. Sir William Temple will by no means allow that a Dutchman ever was in love. There may have been a little heavy romance before marriage, but nothing else than cool realities came after it. In marrying his wife, he did not think it necessary to espouse all

her quarrels, or gratify her pretty whims. Just so in the matter of religion. The reformed faith would have dearly liked a holocaust of Papists, and perhaps upon abstract principles the Dutchman would have had no objection to meet her wishes, if it could be done with profit or for nothing. But as the profit was all the other way, he steadily refused. "You want me to get rid of the Catholics," he said to the Church, "but the Catholics pay me for letting them alone, and so long as they continue to pay, let them alone I must." This process of reasoning, however, applied to Holland only; circumstances were quite different in Ceylon, and there the Dutchman could persecute like any Englishman of them all. Accordingly, we learn from Sir Emerson Tennent, both in his present and in his former work, that the Dutch resorted to every means of persecution, other than death, in order to exterminate Catholicity from Ceylon. Nothing that ingenuity could shape for the purpose, in the nature of fines, disabilities, and vexations, was omitted. To particularize would be tiresome and disgusting. It is enough to say that the penal laws of Ceylon were not much less execrable than our own. The Portuguese and native Christians were subjected to them without intermission for one hundred and forty years, and as we see, without effect. The persecution in Ceylon was adopted for the one purpose of counteracting Portuguese influence, and without the smallest reference to the truth or error of any religion in particular. Throughout their occupation, the Dutch had the mortification of seeing the influences they were struggling to destroy, increase in breadth and power, until at length, when the island was wrested from them by England, they left Ceylon more Catholic than they had found it. The fidelity with which some classes of the Singhalese community have adhered to their religion since the days of Francis Xavier, is certainly not unexampled, but it will bear comparison with that of almost any other tribe or people. The fisher caste supplies one startling illustration of it, and puts Sir Emerson Tennent upon speculating how it comes to pass, that fishermen everywhere in India have been the earliest converts to Catholicity. "Elsewhere," he says in a note, "I have alluded to the singular fact that the fisher caste have been in every country in India the earliest converts to the Roman Catholic Church, so much so as to render it worthy of inquiry whether it be only a coincidence or the result of

some permanent and predisposing cause. The Parawas of Cape Comorin were the earliest converts of St. Francis Xavier. It was by the fisher caste of Manaar that he was invited to Ceylon in 1544, A.D. ; and notwithstanding the martyrdom inflicted on his converts by the Raja of Jaffna, and the continued persecution of the Dutch, that district is to the present day one of the strongholds of the Roman Catholic Church in Ceylon; and the fishermen along the whole of the south-western coast, as far south as Barborga, are in the proportion of one half Roman Catholics. Is it that there is an habitual tendency to veneration of the Supreme Being amongst those "who go down to the sea in ships and see His power in the great deep?" Is it that being a low caste themselves, the fishers of India and Ceylon acquire a higher status by espousing Christianity, or have they some sympathy with a religion whose first apostles and teachers were the fishermen of Galilee?"

Regarding the same "fisher caste," Sir Emerson Tennent again alludes in these volumes to a circumstance of which he had previously made mention in his "History of Christianity in Ceylon," and which we noticed at the time. The British Government having remitted the fish tax which had been imposed by the Portuguese and maintained by the Dutch, the fishermen, instead of profiting by the remission, hand over yearly the amount of the tax, and sometimes with increase, to the Catholic clergy. It appears also that the fisher caste does not, as its name implies, include fishermen alone, a portion of the caste having betaken itself to handicraft, and furnishing excellent carpenters, cabinet-makers, and workers in ebony.

In 1796 the Dutch power was brought to a close in Ceylon, by British forces in the Company's service, after a struggle not worth naming, if struggle it could be called, "*Nec illud prælium fuit.*" The British period did not begin with an assumption of sovereignty over the whole island. The East India Company merely stepped into the shoes of the Dutch, and held possession of the seaboard; although in the first instance the kings of Kandy declined to recognise them in any way, or to treat with any other party than the King of England. For two years the colony was governed from Madras, and governed in such a way as to provoke, what Sir Emerson Tennent calls a rebellion, although the word would seem to have no application to the circumstances. No sooner however was the



outbreak suppressed, than the colonial office decided that Ceylon should be governed from England, and Mr. North, afterwards the first Lord Guilford, landed in Ceylon as Governor, in October, 1798. In 1802, at the peace of Amiens, the island was formally incorporated with the British dominions; but it does not appear that the native sovereign was a consenting party to this arrangement.

Mr. North, like any man in the same circumstances, had two characters to fill. He was in Ceylon not merely as a governor, but as a diplomatist. Relations still subsisted between the Kings of Kandy and the Kings of England, as between power and power; and the territory actually under the rule of the governor something resembled the English pale in Ireland. If it be indeed the duty of a diplomatist "to act the liar in a foreign country for the benefit of his own," whatever may be thought of the office, Mr. North must be admitted to have filled it admirably. Never were there more tainted transactions than those in which, by his own disclosures, we find him engaged with the Adigar, or prime minister of the last King of Kandy. The immediate predecessor of Nikrema, Raja Singha, last King of Kandy, having been deposed through the intrigues of the Adigar, the same Adigar, Pilámé Taláwé, procured the election of the Queen's nephew to the kingly office, upon the death of the deposed prince without issue. He expected to find in the new king a ready instrument and an easy victim; and it does honour to his discrimination that he so thoroughly understood Mr. North's character, as to disclose to him without doubt or hesitation a treasonable project which he had formed for the deposition of the young king, and the substitution of himself, Pilámé Taláwé. Mr. North did not at once countenance and abet the project, for that would have been immoral; and what is more to the purpose, it would have been rash to do so; until it should be seen how much profit could be extracted from the immorality. Neither on the other hand did he denounce the treason to the king, for that would have been a violation of honour, which is known to exist even amongst thieves; and doubtless the communications of the Adigar were marked private. Mr. North, for his part, never could quite understand the conduct of Fabricius, under similar circumstances; and it had always appeared to him a gross breach of confidence on the side of the old

Roman to have disclosed the Doctor's secret to Pyrrhus. Everything considered, Mr. North determined to entertain the project, but in a Christian spirit. He stipulated, upright man, for the personal safety of the king. It was next arranged that Mr. North should proceed as ambassador to the court of Kandy, accompanied by 1000 men as an escort, which thousand might, by adroit management, be raised to 1800, or even to 2500, under the command of General MacDonnell. This force was to remain in the capital as a subsidized English garrison; and the king, being thus at the mercy of Mr. North and his worthy friend the Adigar, was to be induced to retire to Jaffna, and there live under British protection. Failing the consent of the king to the admission of this innocent guard of honour, the question was discussed and settled, as to what military aggression on the part of the Adigar, (under orders from the king, of course) upon British territory, would be considered a sufficient and decent pretext for war, to be followed by the occupation of Kandy.

The original project failed. The King, indeed, at first gave his consent to the arrangement, but taking alarm, subsequently withdrew it, and a very modest escort only was suffered to accompany the ambassador. The second project now came into play. The requisite act of aggression was committed by the Adigar, and war ensued according to agreement; ending in the occupation of Kandy by 3000 British troops. The king had already fled, and a puppet king was elected in his stead, whose first act was to instal the British force as a subsidized garrison in Kandy. Last of all, a convention was entered into with the Adigar, in virtue of which the late king was to be handed over to the English; the provisional king was to be sent to Jaffna; and "the illustrious Lord Piláné Taláwé," was to exercise supreme authority as Grand Prince of Kandy.

The "illustrious Lord," however, had one other treason in store which was to crown his success, and that was a treason to Mr. North. He determined to seize the governor, and to massacre the British garrison; to kill the two kings, and to ascend an undisputed throne. The plan succeeded in two of its parts. The British garrison, enfeebled by sickness, and reduced to a very small effective force, was overwhelmed by numbers; forced, after a brave resistance, to capitulate; then drawn into a decoy; and

finally massacred two by two, on the banks of the Mahawelliganga. The unfortunate Mootoo Saamy, whom we have called the Provisional King, was slain in the same place. One man only escaped the carnage. During the interval of twelve years, between 1803 and 1815, the British forces were too weak to attempt any complete or signal act of vengeance. After the massacre of the garrison in the capital, and the flight of other small garrisons, not a single British soldier remained in the Kandyan territories; and the king having escaped the toils of the "illustrious Lord," resumed his throne, and became thenceforward, the most savage tyrant that had stained the Kandyan annals; as well as the most determined enemy of England. Between 1805 and 1815, there existed, at times, a kind of hollow peace; and Pilámé Taláwé, having been detected in a conspiracy against the life of the King, received the reward of all his treasons, by decapitation, in 1812.

Strange to say, his nephew was promoted to the post of Adigar; but it seemed as if conspiracy was hereditary in the family. The new Adigar opened a treasonable correspondence with Sir Robert Brownrigg, the governor, but his treason was discovered, and although he escaped to Colombo, his wife and children remained in the hands of the tyrant, who put them to death under circumstances of the most cruel and disgusting barbarity. At length, in 1815, war was declared, and in the course of a few weeks, the tyrant was a captive in Colombo, from whence he was removed to the fortress of Vellore, in continental India, where he died.

The correspondence of Mr. North with his own government is, if possible, even more disreputable than the transactions to which it referred. We almost pitied Lord Cornwallis, when we learned from his correspondence, how his stomach kicked at the nasty business to which he was obliged to set his hand in the bad neighbourhood of Cork Hill, and College Green. He had a genuine disgust for his work; but Mr. North's correspondence, if you except a few slight and conventional apologies, betrays nothing like real dislike for the multiplied treasons, lies, and corruptions, in which he was engaged. Fortunately, there is no need of instruments like Mr. North, or rather, we should say, no scope for them, in the present state of Ceylon. They never could have been needed. For some years the

Singhalese, although they had formally assented to the sovereignty of the English crown under certain conditions, remained very impatient of our government; and, strange to say, the revolutions of 1848, were not without their effect upon Singhalese society; so strong, even if not indestructible, is the principle of nationality. Since the English government became firmly established in Ceylon, it seems to have been kindly and beneficent in its operation. The island has been intersected with noble roads; and the restoration of some of the great tanks is contemplated; and even railways are in process of construction. Industry is favoured by peace, and religious liberty is protected by the law, although perhaps not always in the same degree by its administration. No man's conscience, at least, is forced, and on the whole, perhaps, our brother Catholics are as well off in Ceylon as we are at home. We have not adverted to much that is interesting in Sir Emerson Tennent's work, such as the description of Adam's Peak, of the Plain of Neura Ellia, and of the climate and scenery of each of the provinces. In truth, the merest allusion to the various subjects which he has treated with such fulness would run into a downright catalogue. But the work has already a good index of its own, and to that index let the reader be referred. He may take, almost at random, any of the heads before him, and he may read under it with very little risk of weariness or disappointment.

---

ART. V.—1. *The Unity of Worlds and of Nature.* Three Essays by the Rev. Baden Powell, M. A., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. Second Edition. London: Longman. 1856.

2. *Christianity without Judaism.* By the Rev. Baden Powell, &c. London: Longman. 1857.

3. *The Order of Nature considered in reference to the Claims of Revelation.* By the Rev. Baden Powell, M. A., F. R. S., F. R. A. S., F. G. S., Savilian Professor of Geometry, in the University of Oxford. London: Longman. 1859.

**W**HAT a strange thing is that compound of discordant creeds and conflicting dogmas which is not

inappropriately designated Protestantism! The name, luckily, does not impose anything positive on true believers; their bond of union is purely negative; all those who reject

“The faith their fathers held to God,”

make excellent Protestants. From the old definition of a true Christian, that he is “one who believes the Scriptures and hates the Pope,” the first clause must be expunged. The last is all that is now required. A man may deny the Scriptures—reject the whole Christian code—laugh at the idea of an overruling providence, and openly proclaim his disbelief, even in the existence of an Omnipotent God, provided he entertains a sufficient horror for everything, however remotely connected with the ancient faith. We have seen, within the last few months, the capital of Protestantism, the citadel of its orthodoxy, the great city of London, agitated to its very centre, on account of the chaunt of a psalm, the cut of a gown, or the colour of a surplice. The abomination was too much for Protestant orthodoxy; the service was interrupted by the most unseemly and irreverent noises; the minister and choristers were treated with violence, and the police could scarcely protect them from personal injury. Lawyers talked, magistrates fined, the press thundered, the bishop remonstrated, all in vain. Sunday after Sunday the Church of St. George was turned into a cock-pit. The great Lilliputian war regarding which end of the egg should be broken was nothing to it. And yet, during this very time, another minister, holding the high position of a professor in the University of Oxford, scarcely excites a passing remark, by publicly rejecting first the Old, and then the New Testament, by denying the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord, and by destroying, as far as he can, all rational belief, even in the existence of a God. The old inscription over the gates of Bandon, might now serve as the motto of Protestantism—

“Jew, Turk, or Atheist, may enter here,  
But not a Papist.”

Under which Dean Swift wrote—

“Whoever has written this has written well,  
For the same is written on the gates of hell.”

What a change has come over the great University of Oxford since her most eminent men stood forth as the champions of Church authority, and of ancient Christianity. The Puseyites, like grey-haired Saturn, are silent as a stone, and the field is solely occupied by one of their evangelical opponents, who proclaims a scripture without inspiration, a Christian religion without a miracle, and an Order of Nature without a God! We feel that these are very serious charges, not against Mr. Powell, but against the Protestant religion, because he takes care to inform us in the very preface to one of his books, that his views are truly Protestant, and perfectly consistent with the formularies of the Church of England.

"In many instances," says Mr. Powell,\* "the Christian doctrines have been formerly maintained in close connection with *physical* ideas, while *those* ideas, and the views taken of them, must of necessity, be liable to change and improvement, as science advances. And if some expressions, apparently implying such connexion, are retained in the formularies of the Church of England, which thus acquire a modified interpretation, it must also be observed that many points, of great importance, are there left without any determination or mention. Thus, to whatever extent individual, or even general, opinion may have given a turn to such questions, they are undeniably perfectly open questions to those who adopt these formularies. Of this class, are the entire subjects of philosophical theism, or natural theology;—the evidences of Christianity;—the immateriality of the soul;—and the nature of miracles."

To Catholics who have been accustomed to the cry of the Bible, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible, it must be something startling to find, on such high authority, that the very inspiration of the Bible is an open question. Nor can it be said that these are merely the opinions of an individual, because in this very passage the Rev. Professor, who was one of the leaders of the Evangelical, or Low Church party in Oxford, during the controversies which arose out of the publication of the Tracts for the Times; and who remembers how Mr. Ward was stripped of his gown on account of the publication of his "Ideal of a Christian Church," throws down the gauntlet, and defies convocation to take it up. We certainly entertain no personal hostility against Mr. Powell,

---

\* Order of Nature, preface vii. viii.



we merely regard him as the exponent of what he assures us are the prevalent doctrines amongst the most enlightened class of Protestants, and which are undeniably tolerated even in the Anglican Church. Treating of the nature and attributes of God, Mr. Powell says : \*

"The actual claims of moral science to establish a foundation for these more sublime truths, are very slight: the old *a priori* metaphysical theistic argument, and schemes of divine perfections, (especially from the exhaustive criticisms of Kant,) have been generally discredited, not only by philosophers, but by the admission of the most orthodox divines; in the views of the same kind which others have sought to substitute, we can find little which seems more satisfactory. To attempt to reason from law to volition, from order to active power, from universal reason to distinct personality, from design to self-existence, from intelligence to infinite perfection, is, in reality, to adopt grounds of argument and speculation entirely beyond those of strict philosophical inference, and it would be more consistent openly to avow the insufficiency of scientific views for realising those loftier contemplations and theistic conceptions, than to gloss over the difficulty by an ambiguous and metaphysical phraseology; and owning the inadequacy of reason to recur to faith. And, in fact, the most candid of such reasoners usually, in the end, fall back on the simple appeal to the common feeling and general religious sense of mankind *in the belief in a deity*, an appeal which, however, just in itself, is simply a confession of the insufficiency of philosophical reasoning—the only point in dispute."

Thus, according to Mr. Powell, the most orthodox and most candid divines admit, that the *existence of God* cannot be proved *by reason*, but by faith,—a faith, be it remembered, not founded on reason, but on common feeling and religious sense,—a faith which is not derived from the word of God, since no such word exists, a faith therefore, which is pure moonshine. But let us hear what follows :

"The firm conception of the immutability of order (that is, that there can be no real miracle) is the first rudiment in all scientific foundation for Cosmo-theology (whatever that means). Our conclusion cannot go beyond the assumption in our evidence. Our argument can lead us only to such limited notions of the divine attributes, as are consistent with the principle of 'Cosmos' (whom we take to be a near relation of Sergeant Buzfuz). If we speak of wisdom,

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 243-249.

it is as evinced in the laws of profoundly adjusted reason; if of 'power,' it is only in the conception of universal and eternal maintenance of those arrangements; if of 'infinite intelligence,' it is as manifested throughout the infinity of nature; and to whose dominion we can imagine no limit, as we can imagine none to natural order....The simple argument, from the invariable order of nature, is wholly incompetent to give us any conception whatever of the Divine Omnipotence, except as maintaining, or acting through, that invariable universal system of physical order and law. Any belief which may be entertained of a different kind must essentially belong to an order of things wholly beyond any conclusions derived from physical philosophy, or Cosmo-theology. A theism of omnipotence in any sense deviating from the order of nature, must be entirely derived from other teaching: in fact it is commonly traceable to early religious impressions, not from any real deductions of reason, but from the language of the Bible... The Supernatural is the offspring of ignorance, and the parent of superstition and idolatry (?): the Natural is the assurance of science, and the preliminary to all rational views of Theism...It is a mistake to confound with the deductions of science, these more sublime conceptions and elevated spiritual views of a Deity,—a personal God,—an Omnipotent Creator,—a moral Governor,—a Being of infinite spiritual perfections, holding relations with the spirit of man;—the object of worship, trust, fear, and love;—all which conceptions can originate only from some other source than physical philosophy. These are conclusions which science must confess entirely to transcend its powers, as they are beside its province, to substantiate."

Now, unless reason can clearly establish the existence of a personal God—of a God to be feared, worshipped, and loved—in some way or other, either from nature itself, or from supernatural revelation, confirmed by supernatural interference, by miracle or prophecy, there can be no demonstration at all of the existence of God. When Mr. Powell thrusts his tongue into his cheek and tells us that those *sublime truths*, such as the existence of God, can be proved neither by reason nor by revelation, but must rest on *religious faith*, he cannot expect us to believe him to be serious. But, indeed, Mr. Powell leaves us in no doubt, either as regards his own views, or those of "some of the most orthodox divines."

"Some of the most orthodox divines," he assures us, "denounce 'the pride of unsanctified intellect, irreverently intruding its criticisms into what ought to be veiled in religious reserve:' by consequence the miracles and the records of them would be sheltered from criticism, and thus virtually removed from the province of

history, to be placed within the pale of *religious faith*. Thus, then, theologians seem practically to approach towards the view of miraculous narratives, as compositions whose proper object is not so much the *events* they relate, as the *doctrine* and *instruction* they embody, and thus approximate in principle to the mystic theory. While philosophy is freely allowed its proper dominion in regulating general physical views, and criticism in sifting documentary evidence, faith is duly recognised in the acceptance of truths, which, from their nature, could not be objects of scientific knowledge, and are not affected by the *decisions* or doubts of criticism. The literal sense of physical events, impossible to science, cannot be essential to *spiritual truth*; nor have contraventions to natural order any necessary connection with *vital Christianity*. The philosophic thinker, whatever view he takes of any, or all, of the rationalistic speculations, will perceive that the grand inductive principle of the immutable uniformity of natural causes,—the sole substantial ground for belief in a supreme moral cause,—must ever remain unassailed; and firmly grasping this broad principle on the one hand, and perceiving the essential spirituality of Christianity on the other,—he will repose on these convictions, and admit that the *miraculous narrations of the Gospel* may be received for the divine instruction they were designed to convey, without prejudice to the inviolable laws of physiology, of gravitation, or of the constitution of matter.\*

#### Again:

"But it must in fairness be added, that what is here remarked is no imputation on the *reality* or *earnestness* of a religious belief founded on such a traditional basis. The spirit of *faith*,—so nearly allied to the æsthetic and imaginative faculties of our nature,—may be most *ferently* and *sincerely* associated with what is *fabulous* or *mythical*, or may attach itself to a *high spiritual truth* under the *outward imagery* of a marvellous narrative. It has even been contended that mystery and parable are *more* truly congenial to the nature of faith than *fact* and *history*, which are rather subjects of reason and knowledge, far below the aspirations of the spiritual mind."†

The obvious purport of this passage is, that the spiritual aspirations of the mind soar far beyond the regions of reason, of knowledge, and therefore of truth, and find their proper objects in the higher world of faith, of fiction, and of marvels. But, to proceed with our extracts.

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 376-7.

† Ibid. 427-8.

"From what has preceded it appears that while the difficulties of miracles are fully seen, if not explicitly avowed by some theologians, the acceptance of them is regarded purely as a matter of religious faith and spiritual apprehension, not as a point of reason, or a deduction of the intellect,—to which they admit it is even opposed. And thus this confession on the side of religion entirely concurs and harmonises with the verdict of philosophy, which, if it fail to recognize physical interruption, freely acknowledges spiritual influence and the power of faith; and where its own dominion ends, cordially recognises the landmarks of the neighbour territory, and allows that what is not a subject for a problem may hold its place in a creed. In a past age, as we have already noticed, great stress was laid on certain precise, evidential arguments, especially turning on inference from miracles. The exclusive, or even principal, importance of this class of *proofs*, has in later times been greatly called in question, *even by* orthodox theologians, who have evinced a disposition to recede much from formal arguments, addressed to the intellect, and to prefer an appeal to spiritual conviction and religious sense. . . . Thus, on every ground, from the nature of the case, from the arguments of the learned, from the practical confessions of the unlearned, from the admissions of the orthodox, and the controversies of the heterodox,—on the combined considerations of the remarks last made, and the facts and authorities formerly cited,—we can only arrive at the conclusion that the belief in miracles, whether in ancient or modern times, has always been a point, *not of evidence* addressed to the *intellect*, but of *religious faith* impressed on the *spirit*. The mere fact was nothing: however well attested, it might be set aside: however fabulous, it might be accepted—according to the predisposing religious persuasion of the parties. If a more philosophical survey tend to ignore suspensions of nature, as inconceivable to reason, the spirit of faith gives a different interpretation, and transfers miracles to the more congenial region of spiritual contemplation and divine mystery."\*

We shall hereafter notice the evidence of miracles, but we cannot pass over the shallow disingenuousness of the last sentences which we have just quoted. When he asserts that the *mere fact*—that is, its truth or falsehood—was nothing, because, however well attested, it might be set aside, and however fabulous, it might be accepted, he has omitted one word which appears to us to be of some little importance. It is quite true that a fact, however well attested, may be *unreasonably* rejected; however fabulous and ill attested, it may be *unreasonably* accept-

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 429-440.

ed, but if this argument would prove that the fact itself was nothing, it would put an end to all history, all philosophy, all truth. It is equally false to assert that miracles, whether ancient or modern, were received or rejected, according to the religious persuasion of the parties. Prejudice, no doubt, is very powerful with regard to matters of *opinion*, but great numbers of persons, men and women, at different times and on different occasions, many of them possessing strong and well-informed minds, do not sacrifice everything, even liberty and life, for the purpose of testifying that they were actual witnesses of facts which never occurred at all. Take, for instance, the case of the death and resurrection of our Lord. Had any imposture been intended, would He have predicted that He would rise again within the space of three days? His enemies had only to make sure of His death, and to take care that the body was not removed during the brief period of three days. Does any one believe that those relentless enemies who vociferated for His blood, did not make themselves certain that He was really dead, or that having obtained a guard to watch the sepulchre, because that seductor had said whilst living, after three days I will rise again, they did not take care to see that the body was in the sepulchre before they sealed it; or finally, that the Apostles, one of whom had betrayed and another denied his Master, would have approached the guards with the desperate hope of stealing away the body, without being perceived either by the soldiers or by the Jews? At all events the charitable insinuation that the Apostles might have been deceived as to the fact of their Master's death is utterly absurd. If they *stole* His body in a state of suspended animation, or in any state whatever, they knew that they were impostors.

So also with regard to the facts of the resurrection and ascension. They declared that He appeared to Magdalen, to the other women, to Peter, to the two disciples, to the Apostles, when Thomas was absent, and again when he was present, and that He ascended in the presence of more than five hundred brethren. Mr. Powell does not believe in ghosts, but our Lord proved the reality of His bodily resurrection, by speaking with His Apostles, eating with them, and making them touch and see that a spirit had not flesh and bones as He had. He afterwards appeared to St. Paul, on the road to Damascus. The Apostles could

not have been misled as to these facts: either the facts are true, or the Apostles are (as St. Paul declares, 1 Cor. xv.) false witnesses and impostors. The fact is, our senses are just as capable of judging of miraculous facts, as of any other facts whatever, and a number of persons, who are in the full enjoyment of their reason, can no more be deceived with regard to the reality of the return of a dear and intimate friend from the grave, who has only been absent three days, who associates with them during the light of day, talks with them as of old, eats with them and touches them, than they could be deceived as to the reality and identity of the same person, if, without being dead, he had returned after an equally short absence.

Secondly, it is utterly untrue that the Jews or Gentiles, who became converts, were led by their religious convictions, to receive as realities, except after the most severe examination, the miracles of our Lord and of His Apostles. They were both, on the contrary, most violently prejudiced against our Lord. The Jews had hoped for a great king and temporal deliverer; the Gentiles despised the Jews and their religion, and nothing but the irresistible truth of the miracles could have united them together in the Christian Church.

Thirdly, it is not true that even the unbelieving Jews denied the reality of our Lord's miracles. On the contrary, they said of some of them, it is manifest and we cannot deny. Even Mr. Powell says "the Pharisees did not *at all deny* the miracles of Christ, but set them down to the influence of *evil spirits*."\* He adds, "That though accepted by properly disposed minds, they were rejected by others." This is not true: they did not ascribe our Lord's miracles, generally, to evil spirits, but only the casting out of devils, and on this point He silenced them. We shall explain hereafter how it occurred, that though they could not deny the miracles—that though all were forced to admit their truth—yet many obstinately rejected our Lord and His doctrine.

We must guard our readers against another assertion contained in our last extracts from Mr. Powell. No doubt they must have been astonished to learn that the "*invariable* uniformity of natural causes," or in other words,

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 435.



the denial of all miracles, is the sole substantial ground for belief in a supreme moral cause. Of this we shall say something before we conclude: our immediate object is to show them, that by this "supreme moral cause," Mr. Powell does not mean God. Having quoted some expressions of Stirling, who says, "everything within nature has a physical cause," he adds:

"This I think does justify us in contending that nature as a whole has a moral cause;—it is the very evidence of it. The notion of a moral cause, to which I refer, is nothing else than what arises necessarily out of the conception of the vast assemblage and orderly combinations of physical causes. As to any idea of personality, power, or moral attributes, all these I entirely agree, must be derived from quite other sources, as they are conceptions of a totally different order."\*

He continues:—

"If indeed the author (Stirling) meant simply to transfer the belief in a Deity altogether from the domain of *reason*, to place it in that of *spirit*, to found it on the sole consciousness of internal emotion, or the intuitive impressions of individual experience, this would be a view to which the philosophical argument offers no disparagement, though it does not reach up to it. *A personal God, a moral governor of the world, the Divine Will and Power* originating material things, and calling forth intellectual and spiritual life, are doctrines not of science, but of faith, and repose on the same ground as all other religious doctrines. As to the nature of these grounds, they will necessarily be different in the case of different individual minds. But in point of fact it is, I imagine, the case that by far the larger majority derive such conceptions from the language of the Bible, instilled into their ears and memory from earliest childhood; though doubtless there are many who adopt them from higher spiritual impressions and internal feelings and convictions, but in either case from sources wholly distinct from the teachings of science."†

A little further on (p. 162) he says, Newton's notion that planetary perturbations would require a special interference for restoring the equilibrium, was applauded as the only (?) satisfactory acknowledgment of a superior power. "We merely ask, *If this be the true argument, what now becomes of the conclusion?*" the italics are the author's. So also he prophesies will the geological

---

\* Unity of Worlds, p. 136, note.

† Unity of Worlds, p. 157-8.

argument, which can only explain the abrupt introduction of new species and genera into the world of organized beings, by the interference of a supernatural cause, fall to the ground, when future discovery shall disclose the connection between the apparently abrupt changes in the order of organized beings. It is not that the author rejects particular arguments which have been usually adduced to prove the existence of a Supreme Being, whilst he relies upon others; he rejects them all not merely as unsatisfactory, but as absolutely false; and having maintained that there are no reasonable grounds for believing in a personal God, he asserts that the supernatural is the parent of idolatry.

It seems, after this, almost superfluous, to notice the author's opinions regarding scripture and inspiration. In fact, he has written a book (*Christianity without Judaism*) to prove that the representations of the creation, deluge, and other scriptural narratives of a physical kind are utterly false, and that the real reply to objections taken from them is, "that Christianity is not implicated in them, and that they are wholly peculiar to the Judaic religion, with which Christianity has been too commonly mixed up and confused." (Introduction, p. 5.) He then proceeds to deprecate the conduct of those theologians who endeavour to reconcile the truths of Geology with the Old Testament, and declares that no attempt at reconciliation can hold its ground in the face of the better information now universally diffused. (p. 14.)

Of course no person could have been imposed on by such a shallow pretence; these portions of the Old Testament being constantly referred to as literal facts in the New. The author himself has, it appears, at length discovered this, and acknowledges in his recent work, "*The Order of Nature*,"\* that the Christian Scriptures have borrowed these doctrines from the Jewish. He then enumerates several scriptural statements of, he is pleased to say, an apparently physical kind, such as have reference to the state of our first parents in Paradise, which he declares to be fabulous, because physical death is the necessary condition of animal existence in this world, as the slightest reflection must show that immortality of the body on this

---

\* P. 444, et seq.

earth would be simply a physical impossibility. (p. 445.) Of course he pays no attention, does not even condescend to notice the statement that life was to be preserved by means of divine interposition. In the same page he informs us that the discovery of chloroform has practically annulled the Mosaic denunciation on parturition. In order to effect this it should be applied in every instance, its application should never be attended with danger, and it should remove all the suffering and peril, before and after, as well as in the act of parturition, for to all these does the curse clearly extend. Regarding the descent of the whole human race from a single pair, he says, "Though there can be little doubt that the writers of the New Testament held the common belief of their countrymen on this point, as derived from the Mosaic writings, yet they no where lay any stress upon it; nor would the spiritual and practical doctrines they found upon it be in the least invalidated, even if the opinion of a diversity of race, so much advocated by some philosophers, should eventually be proved."\* Our Lord Himself, (Matt. x. 19), and St. Paul, (Rom. v.), put forth this statement as a literal fact, and ground their reasoning entirely upon its truth. But Mr. Powell is clearly of opinion that they knew nothing about the matter. They adopted the statement of Moses, whose physical statements are usually false. It is quite clear that he regards himself as a much cleverer fellow, not only than Moses, but even than the Apostles or our Lord Himself.

"We find," he says, "numerous references and allusions, more or less direct, in the New Testament, to the physical statements and representations of the Old; such as to the creation, the account of Adam and Eve, the deluge, the Mosaic and prophetic miracles, and the like. In general it may be supposed admitted, that such references would be made by the Apostles and Evangelists, as Jews, in the literal acceptance of their contemporaries. Various expressions of the sacred writers, *literally* of a peculiar *physical* import, in accordance with the ideas of their age, obviously cannot now be understood in the same sense, or possess the same force in the existing state of knowledge."†

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 447.

† Ibid. p. 447-8.

Regarding a future life, the author assures us that its announcement, as well as

“That of the manner and circumstances in which it is predicted to take place, forming, as it does, so prominent a topic in the New Testament, is delivered in terms, no doubt, directly derived from material objects, and expressive of physical agency, which may reasonably be supposed as a mode of representing unseen mysteries to human apprehension by sensible imagery, and in their literal sense can no more be insisted on than the literal period of their occurrence, so undeniably assigned in the apostolic writings, as then close at hand.” (p. 450.)

That many Christians thought the end of the world at hand, is quite true, but it is so far from being true that it is contained in the Apostolic writings, that St. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians for the express purpose of disabusing them of their false impression on this point. (2 Thess. ii. 2.) Mr. Powell adds, that though “we do not know the changes which matter and life may undergo, (naturally of course), yet these must fall infinitely short of those elevated contemplations—rather are of a wholly different order from any ideas of a future state to which Christianity points; and which are wholly incomprehensible to human reason, and exclusively the embodiments of revelation and objects of faith;” neither of which, be it remembered, prove the real physical existence of their objects, but, on the contrary, are the pure embodiments of our own internal feelings and religious aspirations.

The future life being thus a mere shadow, of course its “representations are put forth in the New Testament in a sense wholly different from that of any philosophical speculations on an *immaterial or immortal principle existing in man*, and in no way dependent on the question of materialism or immaterialism. It is spoken of in spiritual language as ‘a mystery,’ (1 Cor. xv. 51.) which conveys no ideas congisable to reason; and the whole doctrine, as delivered by the Apostle, is altogether alien from any philosophical views whatsoever, physical or metaphysical, and is wholly *the creation* of inspiration, the teaching of faith.” (p. 451.) Inspiration and faith, as understood by Mr. Powell, are the media for conveying not real physical or metaphysical truths, but imaginary feelings, “airy nothings.” He admits that this doctrine of a future life is expressly made of the most fundamental importance by the

Apostle, (1 Cor. xv.) although the precise nature of the event spoken of is not in the slightest degree hinted at. The metaphor of the seed sown, and the plant springing up from it, has manifestly no analogy with a material body and an immaterial soul. He then refers to St. Paul's appeal to our Lord's resurrection, and continues,

"In such representations there is no parallel in *reason*; they can be accepted solely as matters of *faith* and *revelation*, in the sense put on them by the Apostle. Such instances only show how entirely spiritual mysteries must stand on their own ground, and can be in no way amenable to any natural comparisons or material conceptions. They are matters necessarily *unsatisfactory to curiosity, unapproachable by reason, yet sufficient for faith*—and for *practice*."—p. 451-2.

He must have given a quiet wink when he wrote the last words. Having thus disposed of the resurrection of the body, and treated St. Paul as a very silly logician, he proceeds to get rid of the soul entirely. He informs us that any expressions of the New Testament writers, which seem to imply the existence of a distinct spiritual principle in man, nowhere assert it in any precise or physiological sense. The material and immaterial theories of metaphysicians, he contends, affect in no way the doctrines of Christianity. "So long as man is admitted to have the capacity for receiving, and the power of acting in accordance with Divine inspirations, (from whom these are derived he does not condescend to inform us,) it is wholly irrelevant whether his constitution be believed to consist of material atoms, or of immaterial entities, or a combination of both." (p. 452-3.) It is not necessary to point out the unblushing falsehood of these assertions, which are contradicted by every page of that Scripture to which he accords a delightfully convenient spiritual belief. But in another of his works (the Order of Nature,) he gives us his own, and therefore, of course, the real philosophical opinion of man's nature. He there entirely ignores the doctrine, that it is the soul which animates the body—if the soul be regarded as a distinct spiritual principle. "Some philosophers," he says, "have represented animated beings as in fact nothing more than *walking galvanic batteries*," which, as well as all similar theories, *may* be false. (p. 68.) "But all this in no way affects the conviction of the existence of some physical principle, the cause of the vital func-

tions, as yet indeed unknown, but which," he assures us, "will at some future time become as well known as the principle of respiration or the circulation of the blood." Any amount of Cosmical prophecy is preferable to the simple and plain revelation of Scripture. Even the fact that chemical analysis, which has reduced organized products to determinated elements, has never been able to produce an organic substance, or to invest an organic substance with life; and the remembrance of the ridicule which Messrs. Crosse and Weekes drew down upon themselves by declaring that they had evolved insect life by galvanism, does not deter him from prophesying that mankind may yet be discovered to be natural magnets in breeches and crinolines.

Here, then, is this grand idea, as we are assured, of enlightened modern Protestant Christianity! Man without a soul, without a Creator, (except Cosmos,) without responsibility, without a future life; Faith without truth; Religion without a God. Oh! we beg pardon, any one who must have a God, may make one to suit his own imagination, provided he does not believe him to be self-existent, or a creator, both which ideas are equally and hopelessly beyond the possible grasp of the human faculties (255); provided also He be not supposed to be the author of life which flows from some great unknown law of Cosmos, who also varies the species when convenient, (253) and finally provided He be not supposed able to exercise any power over the material world, as some ignorant persons formerly reasoned, that He who created nature, could, (not when *necessary*, or to *meet emergencies*, at least in the sense in which Mr. Powell adroitly puts those words into their mouths, but) when He pleases, suspend its laws. (292.) We prefer doing without a God at all to accepting such an imbecile as this from the manufactory of Powell, Cosmos and Co. Shades of Apostles and Martyrs, was this the chimera for which you died, was it this you substituted for Paganism?

One or two matters, however, still disturb the author's serenity—the introduction of life, the change of species, and the allegation of miracles. If Cosmos has not been able to do the two first, but has derived them from a supernatural power, and if he has been sometimes rudely interrupted by the last, it is clear, after all, that he is but the slave of a high overruling power.



Regarding the first point Powell says the vital powers were contained in nature, and evolved out of it like magnetic and galvanic forces. Now, according to the true inductive principle which he talks of, *usque ad nauseam*, no hypothesis for the explanation of natural phenomena can be admitted unless the cause can be shown to have real existence, and to be capable of producing the phenomena which it is put forward to explain. We have already shown, even on the admission of our adversaries, that there is no known cause in nature capable of producing an organized being, much less of endowing it with life. To assert, therefore, that any power in nature is capable of producing organized living beings, is manifestly contrary to the whole spirit of the inductive principle.

Mr. Powell does not deny that this world was once a globe of fire, in which no living thing, whether vegetable or animal, could exist. How, then, was life first introduced into it? The smallest blade of grass, the most minute animalcule, can only be produced by its own kind. The first introduction could not have come from Cosmos, it must have been the act of supernatural power.

When Mr. Powell speaks of the introduction of new species, he first abuses all who will not agree with his silly and godless inventions, calling them obstinately prejudiced and bigoted. According to him the whole choice lies between "the production of new forms, either out of inorganic matter *directly*, or by modification of existing organized types *indirectly*.\*" The italics are the authors. According to the first theory Mr. Powell should not be astonished if he found his boots, some fine morning, in a lively conversation, having assumed some intermediate appearance between a man and a monkey, or if the soap were to change into a baboon, and grin at him out of the basin. According to the last, a man's genealogy might be traced from a pea, which, in process of time became an onion, then a cabbage, until at length it reached the dignity of an oyster, and after its descendants had enjoyed themselves for some millions of years in the briny element, one of them at length took to the land, and finally became a man. When Boswell tried to defend Lord Monboddo, who held that men once had tails,

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 173.

by quoting Rousseau for the same opinion, Johnson replied: "Sir, Rousseau knows that he is talking nonsense, but I am afraid Monboddoo does not." We are really afraid poor Mr. Powell does not know what rank nonsense he and others of his school write.

But, miracles may be said to be his greatest abomination. He will not hear of any interference with his beloved Cosmos, because he knows that this must proceed from a power which is above nature, that it must lead, not only indirectly, by establishing the truths of revelation, but even directly to a Supreme Ruler of the Universe, to a Personal and omnipotent God.

*A miracle is a sensible operation contrary to the ordinary course of nature, and produced by the intervention of a supernatural cause.*

We do not here assume that this operation is possible, we simply say that this is the genuine idea of that miracle, the possibility of which Mr. Powell denies, and the actual and frequent occurrence of which we affirm. When we say that a miracle must be a *sensible operation*—or an event, the occurrence of which can be proved by the testimony of our senses, we speak of it as an evidence of divine communication. Invisible miracles, such as the Virginal Conception, are so far from supplying proofs of other doctrines, that their own credibility must be supported by the evidence of sensible miracles.

To explain the words contrary to the ordinary course of nature, it will not be necessary to discuss the theory of causation. When using the ordinary language, "of cause and effect," in relation to the laws of nature, we do not require more than Mr. Powell grants, *inviolable or unconditional sequence*,\* although it would not be difficult to show that this discovery of Hume, notwithstanding the patching of Mill, Powell, and Co., is utterly rotten and worthless.

Fire invariably produces heat, and never cold, it makes water boil, and never causes it to freeze, it always burns, and causes the death of any animal sufficiently exposed to its action. A man, once certainly dead, never opens the grave and comes back to life again. From the certainty and uniformity of these phenomena, or appearances of

---

\* Unity of Worlds, p. 123.

nature, we deduce by analogy general rules by which we foresee what will occur in the ordinary course of things. Hence, if a person who was certainly dead and buried, should come to life again, this event would be contrary to the ordinary course of nature. We also know that such an event could not be caused by nature, but by some power, able to suspend the ordinary course of nature, and acting contrary to it in that particular instance. Such a power, notwithstanding the cavils of Archbishop Whateley, is correctly called supernatural, because it is above nature and has power over it.

"It was formerly a popular argument," says Mr. Powell, "that He who created nature can, *when necessary*, suspend it, or, to meet *emergencies*, adopt extraordinary measures; as if 'emergencies' could occur to omniscience, or 'necessity' to omnipotence!"\* Certainly no emergencies can occur to omniscience, nor is this supposed in miracles. When the Omnipotent established the ordinary course of nature, He did not do so blindly, nor without foreseeing all its consequences. Amongst these He foresaw that it would be wise to interrupt this course on some particular occasions, in order to accredit His messengers to mankind, and in order also to show that nature, however vast and wonderful, is a mere creature over which He exercises supreme power. The interruptions of the order of nature are not after-thoughts; they were foreseen and decreed when the order itself was established. Nor were these decrees of interruption necessary. God need not send messengers at all; or if He did, His infinite wisdom could supply other means of proving that they came from Him. But Mr. Powell's books are sufficient evidence, that these interruptions are wise and useful, because they are evidences mercifully vouchsafed to us, of His existence, of His power, and of His providence.

That our definition is admitted by those who reject as well as those who admit miracles is manifest, because the whole question is, can or does any supernatural power ever produce particular results contrary to the ordinary course of nature? The sentence last quoted proves that this is Mr. Powell's idea of what would constitute a miracle. Again (Order of Nature, p. 212.) he talks of

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 292.

the “ever-increasing conviction of the *universality* and *immutability* of natural order.” A little further on (Ib. p. 258) he says: “I adverted to the case of some who have imagined the possibility of *occasional interruptions* in the grand scheme of universal order, law, and causation, thus producing as far as they might extend, a corresponding interruption and contravention to the evidence of supreme intelligence. Such ideas can only occur to those who have failed to grasp the great inductive principle of invariable uniformity and law in nature.”

From these passages it is clear that Mr. Powell utterly rejects the possibility of miracles, and in fact he considers the impossibility of deducing them from the established order of nature a sufficient *a priori* argument for their rejection, without at all entering into the question of testimony. On this point he presses his Protestant friends very hard. After stating their common belief that “the age of miracles has ceased,” he asks, (p. 259)

“Why, then, do men (Protestants) so universally and habitually discredit the occurrence of miracles at the present day? . . . It is *hardly even a question of evidence*; the generality of mankind (Protestants) habitually assume antecedently that miracles are now inadmissible; and hence, that in any reported case they must be in some manner explained away. . . .”

And again:

“Of old the sceptic professed he would be convinced by *seeing* a miracle. At the present day, a *visible miracle would be the very subject of his scepticism*. It is not the *attestation*, but the *nature* of the alleged marvel, which is now the point in question. It is not the *fallibility* of human testimony, but the *infallibility* of natural order, which is now the ground of argument: and modern science cannot conceive religious truth confirmed by a violation of physical truth.”

Begging his pardon, he here assumes the whole question, that a particular event, contrary to the ordinary course of nature, is a violation of physical truth. When, from our very limited experience of those who have died and been buried, not coming to life again, we infer by analogy, that there is a general law, by virtue of which, no dead person comes to life again, (a law by the way which we might learn by testimony) the inference is only legitimate when it is understood, that no dead person comes to life again *naturally*. If, from our experience

that no dead person comes to life again, we infer that no person can be brought to life again even by God Himself, the inference is illegitimate, it is a begging of the whole question. There is, therefore, no violation of physical truth, which merely says that this cannot be done *naturally*. It is not a physical truth that God might not raise up a dead man by supernatural power. And, indeed, if there be a God at all—not a God of Mr. Powell's making, but a personal Omnipotent God, who has created all things—the *a priori* argument that such a God could suspend the operation of the laws which He Himself had made—for instance, that he could, notwithstanding the general law to the contrary, raise a dead man to life,—is quite unanswerable. But inasmuch as Hume, Powell, and those who choose to deny the possibility of miracles, do not admit such a God, in arguing with them we cannot assume His existence. But neither must Mr. Powell assume that there is no such God, nor that miracles are impossible because they are out of the ordinary course, and beyond the powers of nature. We do not assume their possibility, nor can our adversaries prove their impossibility by any *a priori* argument. The question is one of pure evidence. If miracles have not been performed, the question as to their possibility can be of no practical use. A possible miracle will prove nothing. If, on the contrary, the existence of miracles can be established by irrefragable evidence, their possibility is demonstrated, because nothing can exist that is not possible. Mr. Powell will find it impossible to prevent reasonable men from inquiring into the evidence in favour of miracles. The very attempt, however, to stifle inquiry, is significant. If infidels did not feel that the evidence in favour of miracles is overwhelming, they would not outrage common sense, by asserting that they would not believe that five thousand men had eaten abundantly of five barley loaves and two fishes, which were brought to the place by one boy, the fragments alone filling twelve baskets, even though they had partaken of the repast, and had been witnesses of the entire occurrence. About such a fact, they could be no more deceived, if it really took place in their presence, than they could be deceived about their own existence; and it would be not only impiety, but sheer folly to reject the evidence of our senses, on account of *a priori* impossibilities in nature, regarding which no new discoveries

have been made, and which entirely escaped the penetration of Newton and of Davey.

But then we are told that our senses could never testify to us, with certainty, the existence of a miracle. We freely admit this, because a miracle is not immediately an object of sense. The senses can only testify the external appearances, the miracle is an inference of reason. The outward appearances of a miracle, are all natural objects of sense,—the whole question is as to the power by which these objects of sense have been produced—have they been produced by nature, or by a power which is superior to nature, and which rules over it? Thus, in the case of resurrection from the dead, take the recorded case of Lazarus, for instance,—his looks, his voice, his touch, his eating and drinking, were no less naturally objects of sense than if he had never died at all. Suppose persons, who had never heard of his death, to have mixed in society with him, surely their senses would have judged of him in precisely the same way as they would have judged of any other living man. What, then, does the knowledge of his death add? Simply that the life which this man enjoys has not been given him in the natural way—that he has been raised from the dead contrary to the general law of nature, which says that the dead rise not again *naturally*, but does not say that this cannot be done by *supernatural* power.

Powell admits that, in the case of an eye witness, there could remain no doubt as to the *truth* of the testimony of the senses, but he maintains that no matter what the fact might be, we could never *be certain* that it was really contrary to the laws of nature. The question of testimony, he maintains to be, in reality, but *adventitious* to the question of *miracles*, because, “supposing all doubt as to testimony were entirely removed, as in the case of an actual witness having the evidence of *his own senses* to an extraordinary and perhaps inexplicable fact, still the material enquiry would remain,—*is it a miracle?* It is here, in fact, that the essence of the question of credibility is centered—not in regard to the mere external, apparent, *event*, but to the *cause* of it—not to the mere impression on the senses of the witness, but to the nature of the source whence it is derived.\* He then draws a distinction be-

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 287.



tween an *extraordinary* fact which he admits is a proper matter for human testimony, and the *belief* in its being caused by *divine* interposition, which is a matter of *opinion*, and consequently not susceptible of support by testimony, and concludes thus; "We have observed that a *miracle* is a matter of opinion; and, according to the ordinary view, the precise point of *opinion* involved in the assertion of a miracle is, that the event in question, is a violation or suspension of the laws of nature."

According to this doctrine, supposing that all doubt as to the testimony regarding the facts, were removed, supposing that our Lord walked upon the waters, commanded the winds and the sea to obey Him, that He fed five thousand men on five barley loaves and two fishes, which a boy carried with him, the fragments of the repast filling twelve baskets, that not only at His own mere word, but at that of His Apostles also, during a period of thirty or forty years, disease fled away, the lame walked, the blind saw, and the cold grave rendered back its dead to life again; we should still not be able to infer with certainty, that the general laws of nature had, in any one instance, been suspended by the interference of superior power. We should suppose that all this had been effected by some occult energy of nature; all this might have been the result of unknown laws.

Now nothing can be more absurd than such a hypothesis as this. We do not know all the laws of nature, true. Recent discoveries have brought many wonderful things to light—the magnetic telegraph, for instance. Very true. We do not know what wonderful things may be brought to light hereafter. Granted. But though we do not know all that nature may do, we know very well, and so does the most unlearned person, who has come to the use of reason, a vast number of things which nature never will be able to do. We know that nature will never be found capable of bringing the dead to life again. We know that no discovery will ever be made by which five thousand men can be filled by five barley loaves and two fishes, the fragments alone filling twelve baskets. We know that nature cannot enable man by a mere word to change water into wine, to still the tempest and to heal the diseased. We know, in a word, that nature is not contradictory, but uniform; and not only the fact itself, but the certain knowledge of this

uniformity, and of the laws by which it is regulated, is absolutely necessary for individual security and for the very existence of society. If a man's dead wife might get tired of the grave and come back just as he brought home his new bride; if, when we expected our tea in the morning, the servant came to say that none could be made, as the fire, instead of boiling the kettle, congealed the water into a lump of ice; if the food which nourished yesterday poisoned to-day, it is clear that the human race must soon cease to exist, and the sooner the better.

In fact, no one, not even those who parade this trumpery about miracles proceeding from unknown laws, believes one word of it, for whenever they attempt an explanation of a recorded miracle, they always endeavour to reduce the fact within the boundary of the well-known laws of nature. For instance, none of them ever says, regarding the resurrection of Lazarus, granting the facts that he really died, that he was buried for four days, that he was already rotting in the tomb, that he was truly called back to life by the word of our Lord, the material inquiry still remains, "*is this a miracle?*" The italics are Mr. Powell's, and this is the very doctrine which he has the face to parade before the world, when speaking upon the abstract question regarding the nature of miracles. But when he speaks of the miracles recorded in the New Testament, he never attempts to apply this principle, but treats us to four or five theories, every one of which ignores the facts, in order to get rid of the miracles. The first of these, with which he favours us, is the rationalistic theory of Paulus, "who appears to have been throughout animated by the most sincere desire of vindicating the truth of the New Testament."\* By Paulus and his disciples, who were all sincere friends and vindicators of Christianity,

"The cases of raising of the dead have been viewed as instances of '*suspended animation*.' In the case of Lazarus, they observe that, had not the body been thus preserved, decomposition must have commenced. These cases are compared with the recovery of St. Paul, after being left for dead.† Even the death of Jesus is thus regarded: it being undoubtedly quite out of the ordinary course that He should expire so soon as within a few hours, since

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 320.

† Acts xiv. 29.

crucified persons were known to continue alive for several days; and thus it is avowed that the revival may have commenced as soon as the body was laid in the cave. Medical testimony is adduced to show that a state of suspended animation often exhibits every symptom of death, the only actual proof of which is the commencement of decomposition, and nothing is more insisted on than that the body of Jesus 'saw no corruption.' One of these commentators maintains, that it was not the practice of the Romans in crucifixion to nail the feet, and would thus remove the difficulty of Christ's walking to Emmaus; that He showed Thomas only His hands and His side, while the common belief arose from the desire to see the literal fulfilment of the prophecy. The rare appearances after the resurrection, it is pretended, are accounted for by the necessity of keeping out of the way of the inveterate Jews. Hence also, (according to these views), even the ascension itself is represented as a final retreat from the world; as a disappearance from the Apostles in a cloud which enveloped the top of the mountain; Jesus having gone apart, (*διεστη*, Luke xxiv. 57), which corresponds to *πορευομενου* (Acts i. 10.) not 'going up,' but going away; while the general expressions (*εληφθη* and *ανεφεερετο*), 'carried up into heaven,' being indefinite, it is contended do not necessarily imply the literal bodily ascent familiar to received belief and pictorial representation." \*

Such is one of the theories (*risum teneatis, amici?*) which originated in the sincere wish to elucidate and vindicate the sacred narrative, and the perfecter of which "presented himself as the champion of Christianity," who defended "its records, especially the miraculous portion of them," against the formidable attacks made upon them in the Wolfenbützel Fragments.† Well might Christianity cry out, Save me from my friends. If Christ did not really die and rise again from the dead, Christianity is a base imposture. "For I delivered unto you," says St. Paul,‡ "first of all, which I also received; how that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures: and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures. . . . Now if Christ be preached that he rose again from the dead, how do some among you say, that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not risen again. And if Christ be not risen again, then is

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 328-30.

† Ibid. p. 320-33.

‡ 1 Corinthians, xv.

our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have given testimony against God, that he hath raised up Christ, whom he hath not raised up, if the dead rise not again."

The mythic theory of Strauss (another sincere Christian champion) is next brought forward. Powell admits that it is entirely opposed to the naturalistic theory of Paulus, yet both arrive at the same conclusion, which is the rejection of all miraculous and supernatural events. Paulus, he says,\* regarded "the evangelical narrative as historical, but explained its miraculous events by natural causes." Strauss, on the contrary, "represents the narratives as intrinsically, and designedly fictitious, and as a mythical (that is a lying) invention for exalting the Messianic character." This description of the theory of Strauss, is true enough, but what he says about that of Paulus, is evidently and designedly false.

With regard to our Lord's resurrection, for instance, Strauss says that the death of their master having put an end to the temporal hopes of His followers, in the revolution of their feelings, their bewildered and excited minds created the myth, or to speak plainly the lie, of the resurrection and ascension, which they forthwith declared boldly, and made the basis of the new doctrine. Powell thinks this hypothesis when applied to the Gospel narrative in detail, however plausible in some instances, yet as a whole, overstrained and improbable. However, he thinks its suggestions open to reasonable consideration, especially as regards the conversion of water into wine, the multiplication of the loaves, the walking on the sea, the Incarnation, the Ascension, and other trifles which may be taken in a purely doctrinal or spiritual sense,—that is, the narration of these events may be regarded exactly in the same light as one of *Æsop's* fables.†

The author details at length the subjective view of Feurbach, the psychological view of Ewald, the doctrinal view of Neander, and every view but the true view. Feurbach reduces all religious doctrine, including the existence of God, to a mere chimera of the brain. Of

---

\* *Order of Nature*, p. 334.

† *Ibid*, p. 345, et seq.

Ewald's meaning, Powell is not so certain, but "he can collect enough to perceive a general acknowledgment on his part, that some broader principle ought fairly to be resorted to than the narrow, and (as we may consider it at the present day) generally renounced notion of real violations of the order of nature."\* The doctrinal view, not of Neander, who admits miracles, but as improved by Powell, agrees with the other in denying the objective reality of all the supernatural events related in scripture, and in reducing them either to chimeras of the brain, or to instructive fables. Surely the most fastidious Christian will find in this large and new assortment of religious wares, something that will suit him. Powell might put over his shop—

Venditur hic Narcoticum  
Emeticum Physicum Pysicum  
Et omne quod exit in um  
Præter Remedium.

Catholics may well thank God that they have a Church when they see the Christain faith reduced to such monstrous absurdities. Such things are the natural result of the Protestant principle, as Mr. Powell truly declares in the following language. "When the inviolable sanctity of the claims so long maintained to their unlimited extent by the ancient Church, had been once invaded by the unsparing hand of Protestant criticism, and the plea of reason and free inquiry once recognized, it must be allowed that if one school of Protestantism should have adopted a bolder line of inquiry, or followed it out to a more ambitious extent, it is clearly not so much in principle as in the degree, the mode, the tone, of their speculations, that they have subjected themselves to the censures of the more literal interpreters."† We have dwelt at some length on the newest fashions of Protestantism, both to show to what lengths the principle of private judgment may be pushed, and also to exhibit the transparent insincerity of the pretence that, even if we were sure of the facts, we could never know that any occurrence was really contrary to the established course of nature, and above its

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 363.

\* Ibid. p. 310.

power. Even in the madness of novelty, and of speculation, no one has ever attempted to explain miracles by the application of this theory.

Powell objects to miracles being decisive proofs of doctrine, that many of the Jews who saw and admitted the miracles of our Lord, did not believe in Him; that those who were predisposed in His favour received Him, whilst those who were differently predisposed, rejected Him, and consequently that the works had nothing to do with the matter. Our Lord Himself thought quite otherwise, although Powell has the assurance to affirm that He scarcely ever appealed to His miracles as proofs of His mission. If he were as familiar with the New Testament as with the order of Nature, he could scarcely assert this. When John, hearing of the works of our Lord, sent to Him to know if He were the Messiah, He replied, Go and tell John what you have seen and *heard*; the blind see, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the dead rise again. (Matt. xi.)—But I have a greater testimony than that of John, for the works which the Father hath given me to perfect, the works themselves which I do (alluding to the miracle which He had just performed on the sabbath, and which occasioned this discourse) give testimony of me. (John v. 36.) That by works, he means miracles, is clear from John vii, 21, 23, where He says, *one work* I have done and you all wonder, and He then justifies Himself for healing on the sabbath, because it was lawful to circumcise on that day. Again He admonishes the Jews—"Otherwise believe for the very work's sake." (John xiv. 12).—Finally, not to multiply quotations, He declares: "If I had not done among them the works which no other man hath done, they would not have sin." (xv. 24). It is therefore clear that the mission and doctrine of our Lord, required to be supported by miracles. When a man sees a miracle, he cannot deny the evidence of his senses. He must admit it. But if the doctrine which it confirms be very distasteful to him, he may reject it. With regard to some miracles, he might try to persuade himself that they had been wrought by the power of the devil, and even when he could not do this, he might consider the sacrifices which the new faith required of him too great, and might prefer present to future happiness. Nothing could exceed the repugnance of the Jews to receive a poor humble man as their great and long-expected Messiah; those who re-



ceived Him surrendered their strongest and most cherished predilections to the evidence of His miracles; those who rejected Him, obstinately and sinfully adhered to their prejudices in spite of the clearest evidence. After the resurrection of Lazarus, the chief priests and Pharisees gathered a council and said: What do we, for this man worketh many miracles. If we let him alone so, all men will believe in him: and the Romans will come and take away our place and nation. (John xi.) They here acknowledge the irresistible force of His miracles, but prefer their temporal advantages to receiving and believing in the poor humble Jesus.

Video meliora proboque,  
Deteriora sequor.

It is not necessary to discuss the question raised by Hume regarding the *certainly* derived from human *testimony*, especially concerning miracles, because the very groundwork of his argument,—that nothing is to be believed which is contrary to experience,—is rejected by Mr. Powell himself, (*Unity of Worlds*, p. 290) and we have already shown that we cannot arrive at the knowledge of any physical law by experience alone. Moreover, it is not the *miracle*, properly speaking, which is the object of human testimony, but the external phenomenon, which can be testified with as much certainty as the victories of Julius Cæsar, or the existence of the trade winds. In fact, if there were degrees in certainty, the belief in the miracles of our Lord and of His Apostles, would be much stronger than that which we have regarding Cæsar's victories, or the existence of the trade winds, because the motives are far stronger in the former case than in the latter. In the case of miracles, we have the testimony of persons, great numbers of whom were most reluctant witnesses, because the *truth* of the miracles forced both Jews and Gentiles to abandon their most inveterate prejudices, to adopt an austere faith, to submit in patience from the very first, to the opprobrium of men, to the loss of their property and even of their lives. We do not require the aid of Scripture to prove the truth of our Lord's death, resurrection, and ascension, on which facts the whole Christian revelation rests. The undoubted facts with which they are connected, the propagation of the Christian faith, of which they form the very essence, in the very

place and at the very time when they are said to have occurred, and the heroic constancy with which the witnesses of those facts suffered and died to attest their truth, are arguments so plain, and so convincing, as to come home to the understanding of the most illiterate peasant, and to defy the attacks of the most refined sophistry.

The objection to human testimony is founded on a real or assumed ignorance of moral impossibilities. It is physically possible that every adult in London should turn out naked on the streets some cold winter's morning, and yet we are quite as sure that they will not do so as that the sun will rise to-morrow morning. It is just as impossible that great numbers of persons should continue to suffer during a whole age, and that they should finally shed their blood to prove that they had seen with their own eyes that which they had never seen.\*

We entirely agree with Mr. Powell that Protestants generally, neither have nor can have, any reasonable grounds for their Christian belief. How could illiterate persons—vast numbers of whom cannot even read, enter into the critical arguments regarding the genuineness even of the Gospels alone, the integrity of the text, and its inspiration? The latter point would puzzle Archbishop Whateley himself, and though he has written a book on Christian evidences, and lectured very flipantly on the subject, he neither has, nor ever will prove the inspiration even of the New Testament. He says the matter is quite easy, but he is only able to cite one instance in which a comparatively uneducated person had learned something of Christian evidence. We suppose he remembers the old saw, that one swallow does not make a summer. Granting this one case, what becomes of all the others, who, as Mr. Powell truly observes, have no better reason for their Christian faith than that they have heard it from the parson, or read it in the Bible, without having a single reason for believing in the inspiration of either the one or the other? Surely this is not reasonable faith, but the mere prejudice of education. If there be one thing more evident than another in Christianity, it is this, that Christ, who destined His religion for

---

\* On the subject of testimony, see Dr. Murray's masterly dissertation in the *Irish Annual Miscellany*, vol. 2, chap. 6.

the poor and illiterate, as well as for the learned, never required each man to begin by proving the genuineness and inspiration of his Bible, and then to take his faith out of it. If so, He should at least miraculously teach the uneducated to read. As Archbishop Whateley thinks it so easy a matter [to make out the evidence of Christianity, and truth of its doctrines, we beg to cite the following passage from Dr. Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Prophecy*, sect. 4.

"Since there are so many copies (of Scripture) with infinite variations of reading; since a various inter-punctuation, a parenthesis, a letter, an accent, may much alter the sense; since some places have divers literal senses, many have spiritual, mystical, and allegorical meanings; since there are so many tropes, metonymies, ironies, hyperboles, proprieties and improprieties of language, whose understanding depends on such circumstances that it is almost impossible to know the proper interpretation; . . . since there are some mysteries which, at the best advantage of expression, are not easy to be apprehended, and whose explication, by reason of our imperfection, must needs be dark, and sometimes unintelligible; and lastly, since those ordinary means of expounding Scripture, as teaching the originals, conference of places, parity of reason, analogy of faith, are all dubious, uncertain, and very fallible, he that is the wisest, and by consequence the likeliest to expound truest, in all probability of reason, will be very far from confidence, because every one of these, and many more, are like so many degrees of improbability and uncertainty, all depressing our certainty of finding out truth in such mysteries, and amidst so many difficulties."

Another point in which we quite agree with Mr. Powell is the light in which Protestants regard miracles, and the arbitrary period at which they summarily put an end to them. He says that "the great mass of professing believers (Protestants, of course,) are guided in their reception of Christianity, not by evidential arguments, but simply either by the prepossessions of early education and received opinion, or by what is believed to be the influences of Divine Grace:—miracles are admitted as a *part* of the Gospel, not as the *antecedent* or preliminary *proof* of it."\* He then declares that "even more reasoning Protestant Christians" reject miracles, however positively asserted or firmly believed in their day, simply

---

\* Order of Nature, 436.

because they had no connection with a religious revelation, and that the vast majority of believers receive the miracles in consequence of the assumed inspiration, not as the proof of it. Hence they arbitrarily limit omnipotent power, and declare all subsequent miracles antecedently incredible. Dodwell maintains miracles till the conversion of Constantine, (A.D. 312.) after the last day of which year they were no longer credible. Locke says we must either not go beyond the Apostles, or not stop at Constantine. Whiston extended the period to the end of the fourth, and Waterland to the fifth century. In order to get rid of the miracles recorded in Ecclesiastical history, these authors *necessarily* have recourse to *rationalising* grounds of criticism, which they often apply with no sparing hand.\* “This summary rejection,” (continues Mr. Powell,) of “the appeal to miracles in the early Church—which even the historian of ‘the Decline and Fall’ seems disposed to admit as influencing the convictions of the converts—tends directly to set aside the argument commonly so much dwelt upon, of the *necessity* of miracles for the propagation of the Gospel.” . . . . Yet in fact those speculations of the Rationalistic School, which create so much offence in the minds of orthodox Protestants, proceed on *no other principles* than those which dictate their own critical rejection of the ecclesiastical miracles, and vindicate the disposition to regard them as mythical inventions on the one hand, or exaggerated versions of extraordinary natural events on the other.” After showing that Protestants reject ecclesiastical miracles by the very same arguments by which the Rationalists and Mythists reject the miracles of Christ and His Apostles, the author concludes thus: “Such varied and contradictory views of the Ecclesiastical miracles evince only the perplexity in which the whole question is unavoidably involved—unless taken on far more comprehensive principles, whether on one side or the other, than those most are willing to adopt.”†

What the author says in these passages is so plain that we are astonished to find intelligent Protestants who still obstinately resist its evidence. We at once admit that the Scripture miracles are not only evidences of the truth of Christianity, but also objects of faith. But in the two cases

---

\* Order of Nature, p. 414.

† Ibid. 416-421.

they are regarded in entirely different aspects. They are objects of faith because they form a part of divine revelation; and in order that they may be thus regarded, the divinity of the Christian religion must be already established. As arguments addressed to the unbeliever, they must be rigidly demonstrated, and in this point of view, whatever tests are justly applied to subsequent miracles, are clearly applicable to the miracles of the Gospel. It is strange that even acute reasoners should still be misled by the argument that the Gospel miracles should be admitted because they were necessary to accredit a new revelation, whilst ecclesiastical miracles should be rejected because they are not the accompaniments of a new revelation. Surely it may be replied, that Christianity, which was destined for all mankind, still requires miracles to propagate it in those vast nations where it is still unknown. But in truth the whole argument is a *petitio principii*. Miracles are only to be admitted as the accompaniments of a new revelation. Pray where is this important truth revealed, and is it not just invented to get rid of the miracles of the Catholic Church? Our Lord declared that those who believed in Him should work miracles, without making any limitation as to time, or to persons. Then, when He raised Lazarus from the dead, was the belief of the spectators influenced in the slightest degree by the consideration that Christ came to announce a new revelation? If we need not investigate alleged miraculous facts, except when they are accompanied by a new revelation, of course we need not investigate them when they are accompanied by a false revelation. Now the Jews regarded our Lord's claims to be the Messiah as manifestly false, and His assumption of the title of Son of God, as clearly blasphemous. Certainly those who believed in our Lord's miracles were in no way influenced by the consideration that He came to announce a new revelation. On the contrary, the fact that He came to put an end to the Mosaic dispensations, prejudiced the Jews strongly against His miracles.

Miracles are no doubt necessary to accredit a new revelation; but to say that God may not work them on any other occasion, to propagate that same revelation, or to glorify that Church, to sanctify which He died, with which He remains all days, is the very excess of temerity. We

are not God's counsellors, His arm is not shortened, nor is His mercy limited to our age, or to our country. The invisible, supernatural grace and power which has sustained Christ's Church amid the trials and storms of eighteen centuries, have occasionally manifested themselves in supernatural works. Those *visible* miracles were no doubt most frequent in the beginning, when the Pagan world had no conception of the supernatural; but they were continued at rarer intervals, and they will never cease so long as the Church exists. The Church is not a human but a divine institution, and that divinity must occasionally burst forth in visible wonders, manifesting to a cold and incredulous world the supernatural life which animates the immaculate spouse of Jesus Christ. We do not mean to insinuate that miracles should be admitted except on the clearest and most unimpeachable evidence. We only affirm that as it is impious to reject miracles merely because they are violations of the order of nature, so also is it the excess of temerity to pronounce beforehand, that God will never work another miracle. "Though we may be certain that God will never reverse the course of nature, but for important ends, (the course of nature being the plan of government laid down by Himself,) Infinite Wisdom may see ends highly worthy of a miraculous interposition, the importance of *which may lie hid from our shallow comprehension*. Were, therefore, the miracles, about the credibility of which we now dispute, events brought about by invisible agency, though our being able to discover an important end served by a miracle would be no weak additional motive to our believing it, yet our *not* being able to discover any such end *would be no motive to induce us to reject it*, if the testimony produced to confirm it be unexceptionable.\*

---

\* Douglas, quoted by Dr. Newman. Essay, on Ecclesiastical Miracles, p. xx.



- ART. VI.—1. *Egypt's Place in Universal History*; an Historical Investigation in four books. By C. C. J. Baron Bunsen. Translated from the German by Charles H. Cottrell, Esq. 8vo., vols. I. II. London: Longman and Co., 1848-59.
2. *Ägyptiens Stelle in der Welt-geschichte. Geschichtliche Untersuchung in fünf Büchern.* Von C. C. J. Bunsen, 8vo., vols. I.—V. Hamburg, 1844-57.
3. *The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records stated anew, with special Reference to the Doubts and Discoveries of Modern Times; in Eight Lectures, delivered in the Oxford University Pulpit, at the Bampton Lecture for 1859.* By George Rawlinson, M. A. 8vo. London: John Murray, 1859.
4. *The History of Herodotus.* A new English Version, with copious Notes, and Appendices, illustrating the History and Geography of Herodotus, from the most recent Sources of Information. By George Rawlinson, M. A. 8vo. Four volumes, with Maps, and Illustrations. Vols. I.—III. London: John Murray, 1858-9.
5. *The Encyclopædia Britannica.* Eighth Edition. Article *Egypt*. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1855.
6. *Philosophical Transactions*, 1855, 1858.—Account of some recent Researches near Cairo, undertaken with the View of throwing Light upon the Geological History of the Alluvial Land of Egypt. London: 1855, 1858.
7. *Twelve Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion.* By His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman. Second Edition. London: Dolman, 1842.

THE task which Baron Bunsen proposes to himself, to determine with precision "Egypt's place in Universal History," is unquestionably the most interesting problem in modern historical science. It is not alone that the authentic historical monuments of this mysterious kingdom far surpass in antiquity those of all the other nations of the gentile world: it is not merely that they bear in all their details, a stamp of genuineness which not even the most sceptical can dare to question, and exhibit if not a continuous, at least a connected, series, reaching up to a period in which the annals of other nations are either a hopeless blank or a maze of absurd and inextricable fable. The primitive records of Egypt differ from those of all

the other gentile nations in this also ;—that they alone offer as guarantees, not only of their authenticity, but also of their more remote origin, visible points of contact with the very earliest relics of the history of other races ; and that they derive, as it were, an antecedent confirmation from the records and traditions even of nations whose historical origin is confessedly long posterior to their own. The vaunted annals of the Babylonian, of the Chinese, and even of the Indian Empire, are suspicious from their very isolation. The antiquities of Egypt draw support and illustration from the earliest authentic traditions of Greece, no less than from the written testimonies of the Jewish legislator and historian.

And hence it is that, although the credulous vanity of almost every nation had invented or received a scheme of national history stretching back into the most remote antiquity, yet each of these schemes has in turn crumbled to pieces before the touch of modern scientific criticism. The boasted antiquity of the Chinese and Indian records, as well as of their pretended astronomical observations, has long been discarded as an empty fable. For a time, in the infancy of the science of archæology, and before the alleged observations had been submitted to a critical investigation, Chinese and Indian antiquities furnished material for many a grave impeachment of the Bible chronology. But it is needless to say that in this, as in all other studies, the supposed argument against revelation has, in the progress of the science, been converted into a fresh evidence of its truth.

The time has only now come when the archæology of Egypt is to pass through a similar phase. For although the early Egyptian history differs from that of all the other ancient nations in possessing monuments the genuineness and antiquity of which have never been called into question ; nevertheless, until a comparatively recent period, these monuments, considered as national records, were almost as completely devoid of significance as the stone circles of northern Europe, or the earth-mounds of Central America. Even after their real importance was ascertained, the process of investigating them, for many years, was little better than conjecture ; and perhaps the results which have eventually been obtained, ought to be regarded as fruits of intuition rather than of study. But the revolution, however effected, has been signal and complete.

One brilliant thought, by recovering the long-lost key of the hieroglyphic character, in a moment transferred the monuments of Egypt from the region of mystery or marvel to the world of real life. Science, ever active and ever vigilant, was not slow to claim them as her legitimate possession. The key, once discovered, has been used with ingenuity, with industry, and with perseverance. The effort has not been without its conflicts and its failures; but it has, nevertheless, been energetically sustained: and although much yet remains to be accomplished, substantial success can no longer be regarded as doubtful. The monuments of Egypt have taken their place, the more secure from the very ordeal through which they have passed, among the authentic materials of history.

The ancient history of Egypt, accordingly, comes to be re-written, or at least re-examined, in the new light thus shed upon its earliest period. It may well be doubted whether sufficient progress has yet been made in the examination of the many hieroglyphical records which are known to exist, and even whether the laws for the interpretation of the hieroglyphic character and of the ancient Egyptian language written therein, are as yet established with sufficient certainty, to supply such a body of historical materials as may be used with fully satisfactory results. But, whether rashly or otherwise, the work has been begun; and, if Baron Bunsen's volumes could be regarded as representing the feeling of the great body of Egyptologists, it might seem as if, in the light of the hieroglyphical records, they considered themselves in a position to adjust the history and chronology of the Old, the Middle, and the New Empire of Egypt, with the same cool security with which they would approach a discussion on the written records of Greece and Rome, or even of many of the early mediæval kingdoms.

Other Egyptologists, it is true, have pursued a less ambitious course, confining themselves, in the first instance, mainly to the work of collecting, deciphering, interpreting, and publishing, those of the ancient Egyptian remains, whether monuments or papyri, which partake of the historical character; in a word, of defining accurately what are the real materials of Egyptian history; of giving to them an authentic and intelligible form; and of placing them within the reach of those who, when a sufficient body of historical data shall have been

brought together, may be prepared to undertake the labour of investigating the full bearing of the new facts which they may reveal on the various problems, whether of Egyptian, or of general history. Such in the main has been the course followed by Brugsch and Lepsius in Germany, by Rosellini in Italy, by de Rongè in France, and by Hincks, Birch, Poole, and others, in England. Much had been done in the publication of the monuments through the munificence of the several governments of Europe, beginning with the great work which embodied the results of the French expedition. But the publication and interpretation of the almost equally important historical papyri, has been for the most part, the work of private enterprise, and the merit of it may be mainly ascribed to a single individual—the celebrated Lepsius. To him the Egyptian studies are indebted, not only for the great light which his own individual eminence as a master of the hieroglyphical language has thrown upon the history and antiquities of Egypt, but perhaps even more for the wonderful facilities which his publications have given to other adepts in the science, for proving, comparing, and criticising the results obtained, whether by his own interpretations of the monuments which he has published, or by those of the other scholars who have been engaged in the same pursuit. In truth, it is to the collision or interchange of views thus rendered possible, that we may ascribe the rapid progress of this curious and interesting study. It has been conducted, as it were, in a public, and almost an international school. The freedom with which each system of interpretation, and even each individual interpretation in detail, has been criticised and canvassed by the scholars of the several countries, has been a safeguard against fanciful and arbitrary theories, which could never have been obtained within the limits of any single school, however enlightened. We are far from thinking that, even as yet, that full and undoubting security of interpretation has been reached to which the enthusiasts of the science have laid claim. But, unquestionably, enough has been done in very many cases, to place it within the power of the student of the hieroglyphical language to follow, without reasonable fear of error, not merely the broad outline of facts and circumstances, but even the leading peculiarities of thought, and the general forms of structure and expression.

Nevertheless, we are strongly of opinion that, even still, the work is but in the first stage of its progress. We think that those students have done wisely who have directed their attention mainly to the collection and arrangement of the materials for the study. Many leading facts, it is true, which lie upon the very surface, have been brought to light by the hieroglyphical studies, in a way which it is impossible to gainsay or to misapprehend. These, and all similar results, have fallen naturally into their place in the general scheme of the history. Many of the coincidences with the narratives of the ancient historians, sacred and profane, which the hieroglyphical records have supplied, are of the clearest and most conclusive character; and the admirable translation of Herodotus, now on the eve of completion, which is named at the head of this article, owes most of its attraction, as well as of its great value, to the frequent and judicious use of the hieroglyphical records in the notes and appendixes which illustrate it. In like manner, Mr. Stuart Poole's article, EGYPT, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, is a complete re-casting of the materials of Egyptian history. Part, too, of the task which Baron Bunsen has undertaken, consists in discussing and appraising the several new and historical materials which hieroglyphical science has brought to light, an undertaking for which his great learning, and his practised faculty of criticism and research, have eminently fitted him. The first volume of *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, is as well a repertory of materials for the solution of the problem, as a resumé of the results of the latest researches of those who have devoted themselves to the study. As regards the latter, it is true, and indeed to some extent, also the former, the work is very deeply tinged with the writer's own peculiar views of the Egyptian question; but as a whole, we know no single work in which so comprehensive, and at the same time, so clear and compendious an account of the true sources of Egyptian history, such as they now are, can be obtained.

But, we regret to say, that here our praise of the Baron's work must end. As a collection of materials, it is extremely valuable; as a guide in the search for further materials of the study, it leaves little to be desired; as a simple, lucid, and orderly exposition of the hieroglyphical system, and a judicious recapitulation of the most reliable

results of the modern researches into the Old Egyptian grammar and vocabulary, it is all that might be expected from the well-known industry, learning, and sagacity, of the distinguished author. But as an actual contribution to the solution of the problem of early Egyptian history, we must declare it to be, in our judgment, a complete and signal failure,—more signal for the very pretensions with which it is put forth, and for the bold, dogmatical, and we may almost say, reckless, tone which uniformly pervades it.

Very different is the treatment of the subject by the learned editors of the new *Herodotus* in those portions of the work (the Second and Third Books) which relate to the history of Egypt. We are not acquainted, in any language, with so interesting a combination of ancient and modern learning, as this new translation exhibits. It is, as it were, a calling up once again of the Father of History, and a confronting of him, in criticism or in confirmation, with the monuments which he himself describes; and there is a calm and earnest tone both in the statements and in the speculations founded upon them, which contrasts most pleasingly with the rash and arbitrary, but yet most confident, assertions of the German scholar. The names, indeed, of Wilkinson and H. Rawlinson, are a guarantee for the learning and research which is exhibited in the notes; and Mr. Rawlinson, both in the *Herodotus*, and in those portions of the Bampton Lecture (although it is otherwise sufficiently commonplace) which regard the difficulties against revelation derived from Egyptian history, has proved himself not unworthy to be associated in the task even with such masters of the subject. We shall have occasion to refer more particularly to both these editors hereafter, in more than one matter of detail.

The subject of Egyptian history, even when considered solely in its relation to Sacred history, is much too vast to be considered in detail in a single article; but the simultaneous appearance of the various works enumerated at the commencement of our article, evince such an interest in the study, and such activity on the part of those who are engaged in it, that we think it necessary to bring it under the notice of our readers. The great space to which one of our earlier articles has extended, compels us for the present, to confine ourselves to a summary view of those sources of ancient Egyptian history which have been



recently discovered or at least brought into notice, and to a few of the more important points of detail suggested by the new discoveries, as well as to the inferences which have been drawn from them regarding the credibility of the scriptural narrative.

Up to the time of the great hieroglyphical discoveries, the sources of Egyptian history were sufficiently scanty. The modern discoveries may be more properly described as an illustration or supplement of the existing sources, than as an independent source of history. Many names, it is true, and a few facts or allusions to facts, have been recovered by the aid of the hieroglyphical remains; but they supply no connected history, and but few details regarding the isolated facts or personages which they reveal. Even Baron Bunsen, whose estimate of their importance will not be suspected as below the truth, admits that the monumental inscriptions contribute little to our historical knowledge. "There are but few words," he confesses, "in each line, and what is worse, but little is said in many lines. The inscriptions were *not intended to convey any historical information*. They consist of panegyrics on the king and praises of the gods, to each of whom all imaginable titles are given. Historical facts are thrown aside as something paltry, casual, and incidental, by the side of such pompous phraseology as 'Lords of the World,' 'conquerors of the North,' 'Tamers of the South,' 'Destroyers of all the unclean and their enemies.' " (III. 101.) It is true that the case of the Papyri is different. They are not by any means so meagre. But even from these little connected information has been gleaned. M. Bunsen confesses that "we have much to learn before we can interpret them to our satisfaction;" that it is "much easier to explain the monumental inscriptions, on account of the recurrence of the same phrases;" that, unsatisfactory as are those which have already been deciphered, we "know too much of them to venture to hope that we shall ever find anything different in kind;" (III. 102.) that "although the Egyptians possessed a history, it was not in their monuments;" and that the historical information which we glean from these monuments, "is not of more value than the meagre remains of historical tradition, which the epitomists have rescued from Manetho." (p. 103)

We have said thus much, in order to give an idea of the

general character, considered as historical materials, of those hieroglyphical records out of which the modern Egyptologists propose to reconstruct, and in great part to frame entirely in the new, the chronology and even the history of the ancient Egyptian Empire; and which, in cases of conflict, are held up as a conclusive authority, whereby to modify, and even altogether to supersede, the chronology and even the history of the Bible. Baron Bunsen's aim is no less ambitious than this. According to him we may hope, by the aid of these researches, "to establish the position of Egypt, as regards general history, in point of time; and certainly the adjustment of the chronology is indispensably requisite to an historical development. Its importance, indeed, in the most ancient histories cannot well be rated too highly. The nearer we approach to the primordial epochs of the history of our race, and the vaster those epochs become which it is our business to compute, the more important it is to establish that external relation, and the closer becomes the connection between time and history. In those silent primeval recesses, in those ages the deeds and exploits of which have long been buried in oblivion, and in which some prominent individuals even (the bright point of tradition, and humanly speaking, the lever of all history) manifest themselves at most only by the magic of their names and their influence upon their contemporaries and posterity—in those ages, we say, the adjustment of the chronology is decisive of the last questions which we have to ask in the history of the ancient world, and excludes at once many erroneous suppositions and conjectures. This is the case pre-eminently in the history of Egypt. We inquire whether she exercised material influence on the ceremonial of Jewish worship, on Jewish laws and customs; whether she did so upon Greece, and at what period; whether that influence was direct, or through the medium of other nations; whether the Egyptians can have derived the germs of their wisdom and civilisation from India; whether they are an Ethiopian or Asiatic race, from Meroe or Chaldea. These and other similar questions have been asked in the infancy of research, and still oftener in our own times, and have received very different answers. The restoration of Egyptian chronology may, perhaps, set some of them at rest, such as that of their Indian origin, by negating them at once; and influence

materially the solution of them all. Finally, if in the primeval times of Egypt we approach the infancy of our race, and examine the traditions and theories propounded with respect to it—which consciously or unconsciously, voluntarily or involuntarily, all Christian writers have done—the exact definition of Egypt's place in history will acquire a vastly higher and more universal importance. If, after having ascertained the date of the foundation of the Egyptian empire, we inquire whether it tallies with Scripture tradition as to the creation of mankind, and whether it corroborates the chronological systems based upon it; what bearings it has upon the assumptions of the Greek and Latin churches; or (which will be the most sensible course) if we agree not to *dispute about a few thousand years* where objects so infinitely higher are concerned, how the result of our computations affects the *question of creation*; must we blink the point altogether, instead of answering it? Again, we inquire whether the study of Egyptian history would lead us to the conclusion that there was *one universal, or several partial and local floods*; and whether the most ancient traditions, those of Egypt especially, exhibit any indications of violent interruptions in the early stages of human advancement; and lastly, what light is thrown by our researches, on the great question of *the unity of the human race and its primordial epochs*."

The materials out of which this mighty scheme is to be constructed, are derived from two sources, native and foreign. The only native materials of primitive Egyptian history are the hieroglyphical inscriptions of the Monuments and Tablets, the Papyri, and the Fragments of the Egyptian historian, Manetho, a writer of the time of the Ptolemies. We shall briefly notice each of these three classes.

The great antiquity of the use of writing in Egypt is proved beyond all possibility of question. Baron Bunsen is of opinion that it is at least as old as the time of Menes. This opinion is at best only an inference, and an inference from data which are not absolutely established; but it is at least certain that among the hieroglyphic signs which Lepsius found on monuments which he regards as of the fourth dynasty, are those of the stylus and the inkstand; and the papyrus-roll figured among the hieroglyphics of the twelfth dynasty. Nor can it be doubted that the

Egyptians, from a very early period, possessed sacred books, enumerated by S. Clement of Alexandria,\* the titles of which are 'the Books of the Chanter,' (ᾠδου) those of the 'Horoscopus,' (ὥροσκοπος) of the 'Hierogrammatist,' (ἱερογραμματεὺς) of the 'Stolistes,' (στολιστής) and others of the same class. Besides these, and many similar books, which probably were more doctrinal and ceremonial than historical, there can be no doubt, from what Herodotus tells us, that there were also other and more directly historical records from an early period. "No Egyptian," he remarks (ii. 82.), "omits taking accurate note of extraordinary or striking events." Manetho observes, in agreement with all the Greek annalists, that the Egyptians possessed uninterrupted descriptions of their kings from Menes downwards. Herodotus (ii. 99. seqq.) was also acquainted with lists of kings kept by the priests, in which the events and monuments of each reign were recorded: from one of these they read to him the names of 330 kings, successors of Menes (ii. 100.) Diodorus enters more into detail as to the nature of these lists or annals of the priests, although his information, as we shall see, is less accurate. 'The priests,' he says in the introduction to that part of his work which treats of Egyptian History (i. 44.), 'had in their sacred books, transmitted from the olden time, and handed down by them to their successors in office, written descriptions of all their kings' (from the time of the fabulous monarchs, called heroes, to that of the Ptolemies). 'In these an account is given of every king—of his physical powers and disposition, and of the exploits of each in the order of time.' Artaxerxes in his expedition through the country, carried off these descriptions from the archives of the Temple; Bagoas, his lieutenant, afterwards restored them to the priests for a large sum of money. It was in these 'descriptions,' or at least in works compiled from them, that Theophrastus found his account of an emerald of immense size, which a king of Babylon had on some occasion sent with other objects of great value, as a present to a king of Egypt—probably Necho."

But what may possibly have been the historical value of these and similar records as bearing upon

---

\* *Stromat.* vi. p. 268.

*primitive* Egyptian history, we are, unfortunately, spared the necessity of considering. Not one of these ancient books, whether doctrinal or historical, has been preserved; unless perhaps we are to regard as such the papyri; to which we shall directly have occasion to refer. For all knowledge of their nature and contents we must depend entirely on the more recent historians and compilers—a circumstance, we need hardly say, which in great measure removes them, as independent original materials, out of the range of legitimate criticism, and brings their authority down to the level of that of the authors to whom we are indebted for the knowledge of them. Probably the most ancient materials of Egyptian history are the well-known inscribed monuments, called Stelæ—sepulchral tablets, with the dates of the king's reign under whom they were erected, several of which are deposited in the museums of Turin, Leyden, and Berlin. There is little real history, however, to be gleaned from such isolated fragments, even were not their age, as well as their signification, involved in the deepest obscurity and uncertainty.

Much more importance has been attached to two monumental records, derived from the two most ancient metropolitan cities of Egypt, Thebes and Abydos. The first of these, which is commonly called the Royal Series of Karnak, is from the ruin of the Palace of Thebes, erected by Tuthmosis III. It was discovered in a chamber of this most interesting ruin, and is now in one of the halls of the Imperial Library at Paris. The original site is thus described by Baron Bunsen:

“Let us imagine a tolerably spacious chamber perfectly square, with one door not very large, in the centre of one of the sides. On entering, four rows of figures in calcareous sandstone, representing Kings in a sitting posture, one over the other, are seen upon the walls. The Kings are seated on thrones, the backs of which at a central point, exactly opposite to the door, touch one another. So that in each of the four rows one half of the figures have their faces turned to the left, the other half to the right. The rows in each subdivision contain eight figures with one or two exceptions, where the number is but seven; the first three figures of each subdivision are on the wall opposite the entrance, which has consequently in all six in each (entire) row—the other five (or four) are on the side wall contiguous to it on the right and left. In front at the end of each side wall, opposite to the sitting Kings,

stands—twice repeated—above and below—the figure, in larger proportions, of Tuthmosis III., the renowned fifth ruler of the 18th Dynasty, in the act of offering sacrifice. Each figure is precisely equal in height to two of the four rows, so that one of them is opposite to the two upper, the other to the two lower rows. Before him stand the tables of sacrifice with offerings, occupying sometimes more sometimes fewer panels of the rows of Kings. The result is that the rows contain on the left 31 ( $8+8+7+8$ ), on the right 30 ( $8+8+7+7$ ). A reference to the table at the end of this chapter will render this description more intelligible.

“Over the head of each King is his Royal Ring, with the customary imperial titles. Each is holding out his right hand to receive the offerings. Tuthmosis himself has in one hand the sign of life (the so-called key of the Nile,) with the other he offers to the sitting Kings the gifts which lie scattered before him on the table. All doubt as to the personages to whom the offerings are made is removed by an inscription appended to the right of the figure, in the following terms:

“the Royal offerings

to the Kings of the Upper and Lower country (Egypt).”—

vol. i. pp. 36-37.

The Tablet of Abydos is believed to be about a hundred and fifty years later than that of Thebes. Like its venerable companion, it has been removed from its original site, and now adorns the collection of the British Museum. M. Bunsen describes it minutely:

“The series of Kings of Abydos is sculptured in fine limestone on the wall of a chamber, now destroyed, within the Temple-palace built or restored by Rameses in that primeval royal city. The lower part, comprising the legs, of a Deity swathed in bandages is seated on a throne, holding with both hands a Kukuf sceptre. Lepsius has restored this as Osiris, who may be here considered as the principal Lord of the West, and the Pluto of the Hades of the deceased Kings. He is looking towards a double row of Royal Rings, 26 in number, of so many Egyptian Kings, who are represented seated under their Rings, swathed like Osiris, and wearing alternately the upper and lower portion of the Pschent, the sign of Lordship of Upper and Lower Egypt. Lepsius has restored the horizontal line of hieroglyphics, which was placed over their Rings as follows: *A libation to the Lords of the West, by the offerings of* (i. e. offered by) *their son, the King Rameses, in his abode.* (This inscription is directly connected with the vertical lines or columns underneath it, containing the names of the Kings.) The libation is offered ‘to’ (indicated by the zigzag line of water) each King successively ‘through’ or ‘from the offerings’ (i. e. a dual offering because there are two names in each vertical



line) 'of King Rameses.' Now, judging from the two Tablets at Karnak, where the same King is offering to the Deities 'Phtha' and 'Ra in all their names,' and where the Divinities are on the left, and the King with his offerings on the right of the picture, the King Rameses must have been on the right of this Tablet when it was complete. The two perpendicular lines of hieroglyphics on the left, as restored by Lepsius from an analogous inscription contain the speech of the Kings. They say: (*The speech of the Lords [L.] of the West to their son the creator and avenger, the Lord of the World, the Sun who conquers in truth, we ourselves elevate our arms to receive thy offerings and all other good and pure things in thy palace, we are renewed and perpetuated in the paintings of thy house, we beg to approach at thy side with thee, to rule it like the Solar gate of the heaven, where is the Sun for ever (?)*). Although therefore the votive inscription is entirely wanting above, and only the lowermost part of the two hieroglyphic columns before the King is preserved, both inscriptions nevertheless can be restored with such general accuracy, by means of the precisely similar one above referred to, as fully to establish the fact that the Tablet terminates with the upper of these two rows of Royal Rings. It must appear strange no doubt, that the array of persons who are doing homage to the Great King, in the two nearest compartments of the second row, begins with his own rings. But the very same representations occur in the Temple sculptures, and especially in those of this identical King Rameses. The earthly Sovereign is distinct from him who is one day to be enthroned under 'the Lords of the Lower World,' and therefore is sacrificing to him as a God, just as he might have done, in the Persian Mythology, to his Ized, or, in the Etrusco-Roman, to his Genius. The King receives from him in return thanks and the Divine blessing. A twofold representation of royalty both as an earthly and as a glorified king, seems also to occur on the sculptures of Persepolis. Darius and Xerxes appear in the former capacity—Cyrus, the founder of the Empire, as Ized. Here however one and the same King is delineated in both characters. Four-and-twenty Rings of this row still remain, so that in the two we have altogether 50."—vol. i. pp. 46-48.

These tablets have been a subject of much controversy among Egyptologists. Wilkinson is in doubt whether the Kings of the Karnak Series be Egyptian or Ethiopian. Cullimore is of opinion that the personages represented are, in part at least, not kings but viceroys. Hincks denies to the monument all claim to a historical character; and although Baron Bunsen, taking these tablets in connexion with the Dynasties of Manetho, upholds them as of the very highest authority, yet he frankly admits, not only that "such documents cannot compensate for the want of written history," but that "even chronology, the

external frame-work of history, cannot be elicited from them." (I. p. 32).

More might be expected, at first sight, from the Papyri. One class of these, the funereal papyri, may perhaps be regarded as the only existing representatives of the sacred books of the ancient Egyptians. They have generally been found in the mummy-cases, between the thighs, beneath the arms, or upon the stomach, or in the bend of the knees, of the mummy. A papyrus of this class would appear to have been regarded as a passport to happiness after death;\* and some of those still preserved, are found to have been prepared as articles of commerce, blanks being left for the name and title of the deceased, to be filled up in each particular case as the demand arose. Baron Bunsen's account of these curious formularies is very meagre. A much more minute and satisfactory analysis will be found in the Article *Papyrus*, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* ;† but as none of these funeral papyri, however curious and valuable in illustrating the ancient religion of Egypt and even the social usages of the people, can be considered as materials for history in the sense contemplated by us, we shall not dwell upon them here.

The papyri, which belong more strictly to that class, are very few in number. Only two of these are described by Baron Bunsen.

The first is the so called Scythian Campaign of Ramesses the Great. It contains "a narrative of the expeditions and campaigns of the great Rameses, written not long after that conqueror's death. Several extracts, containing the names of the conquered nations—among whom are the Ir-hen—were published by Salvolini with other historical matter, transcribed, as it subsequently appeared, from papers stolen by him from his master. This Papyrus, with others on cognate subjects—the praises, for example, of Sesostris of the 12th Dynasty—were in 1839 purchased, on the recommendation of Lepsius, for the British Museum, and form one of the gems of that rich collection. The zealous curators of that institution have already published these Records in the most correct and critical

\* See a curious example in Dr. Hinck's "Catalogue of the Egyptian MSS., in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin." p. 31.

† Vol. xvii. 263.

form." If the reader, however, should expect from this papyrus, anything approaching to what in the modern sense is called history, he will be grievously disappointed. It consists almost entirely of encomiums of Rameses, inflated addresses to his soldiers, dialogues of Rameses with various deities, and other matter of the same rhetorical character, which, though highly curious and characteristic, is of little value as material for history. The Rameses Papyrus is not the only one of this class. Others, on the subject of some of the later Kings, are found in the Turin collection, though still unpublished. But of all these papyri Baron Bunsen is found to admit that, "owing to the backward state of the philological branch of Hieroglyphic study, our knowledge of this dialect is unfortunately not yet sufficiently advanced to admit of their translation. Such a result can only be attained by a variety of researches, systematically and methodically followed up. There seems to be no doubt, however, that they contained the praises of the more distinguished Kings, and in a poetical form. Hence, as formerly observed, we have here still *no History in the proper sense*. This is no proof, however, that those songs of the Priests in praise of their Kings were of a mythical nature. They celebrated historical, and perhaps reigning, sovereigns, and may have narrated events and exploits yet fresh in the recollection. They were the work of the most historical and most monarchical of nations, for there is still in existence the amulet of a contemporary private citizen, commemorating the conquests of one of these Kings, the father of the Great Rameses."

The second of the historical Papyri, is the celebrated Turin "Papyrus of the Kings." It had formed part of the Drovetti collection; but from its excessively mutilated and fragmentary condition, it was for a long time unnoticed. Its value was first observed by Champollion, by whom the fragments were partially arranged; but the merit of reducing all its parts into order and restoring the whole papyrus to a form of comparative completeness, is due to Dr. Seyffarth, who most ingeniously employed the microscope in the adjustment of the fragments, by observing and comparing the fibres of each, and thus placing all the parts in correct juxtaposition. The papyrus is arranged in twelve columns, each of which contains from 26 to 30 lines, each line generally containing the name of a king.

The number of kings who can be traced, is about 200; but it would appear from the number of missing fragments, that the lists originally embraced at least 250. The papyrus itself is supposed by Lepsius to date from the time of Rameses II. It does not contain the name of any king later than the eighteenth dynasty. The contents of the Series are thus summarily described :

"The list began (in the first volume of the fragments) with the Dynasties of the Gods. Six names are preserved—Seb (Chronus), Osiris, Seth (Typhon), Horus, Thoth, and Ma (Truth)—by the side of the 7th, in whose name Salvolini fancied he discovered the Hawk, Lepsius found the number 400 appended. According to him, 3140 years are ascribed to Ma, and to Thoth probably 3226. By the side of one of the Dynasties of Gods, or, as is more probable, at the conclusion of those of the Heroes or Manes (the provincial Dynasties prior to Menes), stands, according to Salvolini, the subjoined notice :

"Sum total : 23 reigns, 5613 years,.....months, 28 days."

"This shows clearly the arrangement of the Egyptian Royal Lists. They were divided into Dynasties—by the side of each King the length of reign was registered, and each Dynasty closed with the summing up of the Kings, and of their years of reign. The commencement of a new Dynasty, or a division in the same Dynasty is indicated by red characters.

"In the second column the names of Menes and Athotis are preceded by computations, which unfortunately we are unable to interpret. Thus in line 9 behind Horus we read, '13,420 years,' and then follows :

"'Kings up to Horus, 23,200 years,' (the decimals may have dropped out). Next to this come two mutilated data, where however the name of Menes can yet be recognized (lines 11, 12,)—the thirteenth row still exhibits that of Athotis, the son and successor of Menes, according to the Lists.

"Lepsius has arranged the remaining Rings of mortal Kings in three great masses, in the following manner :

*First* : for the Old Empire :

- |   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| (a) before the 6th Dynasty (terminating with 3 Kings of the 5th) ... .. | 34 Kings, in 10 frag. |
| (b) from the 6th up to the 12th, closing with the latter ...            | 20 Kings, in 6 frag.  |

Making in all for the Old Empire 54 Kings, in 16 frag.

*Secondly* : for the Middle Empire (Hyksos period) ... .. 65 Kings, in 6 frag.

Altogether therefore, before the restoration of the Empire ... .. 119 Kings, in 22 frag.—  
vol. i. pp. 53-54.

We shall have occasion to revert to the chronological questions which arise out of this curious document. But the reader will not fail to be struck by this fact, that, whatever might be the historical value of this, or any similar monument, as a record of contemporaneous, or nearly contemporaneous events, the contents of the Royal Papyrus are in great part, (as in the dynasties of the gods and heroes), avowedly fabulous; and that even where, as in the earlier dynasties, they present a less evidently unreal appearance, their credibility must entirely depend upon questions of age, authorship, and authentic character, which it would now be a hopeless task to investigate with success.

There is another class of historical Papyri which Baron Bunsen does not include in this part of his enumeration of the Sources of Egyptian history—those which are known as the *Exodus Papyri*, and an account of which is published under that title\* by the Rev. Dunbar Heath. If Mr. Heath's account of these papyri could be relied on as established satisfactorily, they would present many very curious coincidences with the Mosaic narrative of the Exodus. According to Mr. Heath's interpretation, these papyri tell of a people among whom was a leader named Moses, marching towards Palestine by the route of Tascarta, Megdol, and Zoar; of a contest at the place of a great water-flood; of an enslaved people of Aramæan origin, who were located about Tabpanhes, being refused permission by the governor to celebrate their four-days' feast, at the beginning of the year; of a royal youth being carried off by a sudden and mysterious death, in consequence of which an order is immediately issued for their being permitted to depart in haste to celebrate their feast of passing the dead; and of miracles being performed in the palace of Lower Egypt.† Again, according to Mr. Heath, a person named Janres is mentioned five times; Moses is named twice. We read of Balak, the son of Zippor, at a place called Huzoth; we also meet the name Hebrew, and as already mentioned the feast of "passing the dead." Such is Mr. Heath's reading of these curious papyri: but it is very doubtful whether these

---

\* The *Exodus Papyri*, by Rev. D. J. Heath. London, 1855.

† *Exodus Papyri*, pp. 57-8.

translations can be relied on. Mr. Goodwin, in an Essay on the subject, in the Cambridge Essays, 1858, repeatedly differs from Mr. Heath, not merely as to points in the translation, but as to the entire bearing of the document, and even as to the subject itself; and we may add, in confirmation of what we have already said, Mr. Goodwin's deliberate avowal that, in the infancy of the art of interpreting the hieroglyphics, "with an incomplete knowledge of the syntax and a slender vocabulary, *translation is mere guesswork*, and the misconception of a single word or phrase, may completely confound the sense."\*

Even Baron Bunsen himself, as we saw, admits, to a great extent, the incomplete and unsatisfactory character of these remains considered in themselves. But it is to the native Egyptian historian, Manetho of Sebennytus, that he looks for the explanation of all their difficulties, the filling up of all the gaps which they leave in the chronology, and the reconciliation of all their inconsistencies and contradiction. To this authority, he seems to defer with the most implicit confidence. In describing the personal qualities of Manetho, he speaks of him as "the most distinguished historian, sage, and scholar, of Egypt," (I. 56) and as "endowed with consummate wisdom" (p. 57); and, in reference to the authenticity and credibility of the remains now ascribed to him, he does not hesitate to say that "the numbers of Manetho have been transmitted to us quite as correctly as those of the Canon of Ptolemy." (p. 87).

We need not hesitate to describe this judgment as a most extravagant and unscientific exaggeration. In estimating the real value of Manetho's authority as to the facts or the chronology of primitive Egyptian history, there are several circumstances which Baron Bunsen either overlooks, or at least sets aside as unworthy of consideration.

In the first place, having flourished in the reign of Ptolemy Soter, about the middle of the fourth century before Christ, Manetho is separated from the events upon which we are asked to regard him as an authority *by fully 3000 years*; and it must be remembered, in addition, that the points for which his authority is chiefly relied on by Baron Bunsen, are dates, succession of dynasties, dura-

---

\* Cambridge Essays, 1858; p. 229.



tion of reigns, and of epochs, and other chronological details, regarding which tradition, beyond certain very narrow limits, is utterly and hopelessly at fault.

Secondly, whatever might have been Manetho's authority, we do not possess his own work, nor even any regular or authentic summary of it. Manetho's Egyptian History *has long been lost*.

It is true that his lists of the dynasties were preserved by the so-called chronographers, Julius Africanus, George the Syncellus, and in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius. But in the first place, Africanus's transcript of Manetho's dynasties has only come to us at second-hand. *This work of Africanus also is lost*; and it is only through the Syncellus, a Byzantine writer of the ninth century, that we are acquainted even with so much of it as contains Manetho's lists of dynasties.

And again, as if to weaken still farther the authority even of this second-hand transcript, the lists of Manetho, as there found, differ materially in many particulars from the same lists as given in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, although the latter profess to be copied directly from the work of Manetho itself. And, indeed, even as early as the time of Josephus, important discrepancies existed between the various editions of Manetho's history which were then in circulation.

One might suppose that such an authority as this,—a witness so far removed in point of time from the period regarding which he wrote, so imperfectly and unsatisfactorily transmitted to us, and so deformed by discrepancies and contradictions even when transmitted, ought not to be received without suspicion, or lightly to be set above other recognised authorities. And yet, with Baron Bunsen, Manetho's authority is held to rank as decisive, even for such minute and inappreciable details as the length of a reign in one of these remote epochs, the order of succession among individuals or dynasties, and the exact duration of the dynasties themselves! With all the critical doubts and difficulties to which we have briefly alluded before him, he does not hesitate to accept Manetho as a voucher, not merely for a question of centuries or longer spaces, but even for small fractional periods of time; and coolly lays down that it may be "*HELD ESTABLISHED that Manetho assigned to the Egyptian Empire from Menes to the younger Nectanebo, a period of 3555 years!*"

Such are Baron Bunsen's views as to the native sources written and monumental of Egyptian history. Among the foreign writers, who have directly or indirectly treated the primeval history of Egypt, he relies chiefly, and indeed we may almost say exclusively, on Eratosthenes. It would be difficult to go beyond the glowing panegyric with which this author is introduced.

"Eratosthenes, next to Aristotle, the most illustrious among Greek men of learning, and as far superior to him in the extent of his knowledge, as inferior in grasp of intellect, was an African by birth, from the Greek colony of Cyrene. Strabo calls him and Callimachus the pride of that city—'for,' he adds, 'if there ever was a man who combined skill in the art of poetry and grammar—common to him and to Callimachus—with philosophy and general learning, Eratosthenes was that man.' He reduced to a system two sciences, both of which he found in their infancy, Geography and Chronology. His calculation of the size of the globe, when submitted to the stricter test of modern science, proved the most correct hitherto made. His adjustment of the leading points in Grecian history, on the basis of the Olympic era—upwards to the time of the Heraclidæ, and downwards to that of Alexander the Great—was and continued to be the groundwork of all the chronological researches of the old world. In geography he was the guide and authority of Strabo and Ptolemy—in chronology of Apollodorus and the later calculators. He was the founder of historical criticism for the primitive ages of Greece. Lastly, he ventured to doubt the historical truth of the Homeric legends. "I will believe in it," said he, "when I have been shown the currier who made the wind-bags which Ulysses on his voyage homewards received from Æolus."

"The extent and depth of his geographical researches, as known to us through Strabo, prove that his historical inquiries were not limited to the world of Hellas. But in this latter department he is more especially distinguished as the first and greatest critical investigator of Egyptian antiquity. His remark upon the tyrant Busiris, as recorded by Strabo, and the ridicule with which he treated the popular Greek legend concerning him and his human sacrifices, may here be cited as peculiarly characteristic: 'By Jupiter,' said he, 'there never was such a tyrant as Busiris—not even a King of that name.' In two other passages of still greater importance in their critical bearing on Egyptian history, though hitherto little appreciated, he elucidates the historical connection between the native tribes of South Africa and Asia towards India, and the Egyptians. 'The four principal races of South Africa,' he remarked according to Strabo, 'have not only a well-regulated monarchical constitution, but also stately temples and

royal palaces; the beams in their houses are arranged like those of the Egyptians.' In his description of the southern promontory of Arabia, at Babelmandeb, he says, 'here must have stood the pillars of Sesostris inscribed with Hieroglyphics.' This he follows up with a detail of the campaign of that conqueror in those parts, which we reserve for our illustration of his own era.

"Every notice therefore relative to Egypt, emanating from a man of such rare talent and extensive learning, is deserving of the highest respect. Besides which, we must also reflect that for the history of Egypt, above that of all other countries, every attainable material was at his disposal. Born in the 126th Olympiad, about 276 B. C., in the early part, consequently of the reign of Philadelphus, he succeeded, probably under Euergetes, to the honourable post of Director of the Alexandrian Library, which he filled up to the time of his death (in his 80th or 82nd year, in the 146th Olympiad).

"The very researches to which our attention is here directed, were undertaken by command of the King, consequently with every advantage that Royal patronage could procure for the investigation from the Egyptian Priests. They were more especially devoted to the 'so-called Theban Kings.' This expression designates literally such as were of Theban origin. But the first of the series, Menes, was not of that race—he was the hereditary prince of This; on which account he and his successors were entitled Thinite, and as such are cited by Manetho. In the passage before us, however, the expression is 'so-called Theban Kings,' the true sense of which will become more apparent by reference to the general contents of the List."—pp. 119-21.

Indeed, so profound is the Baron's veneration for this prodigy of critical acumen and accurate research, that he does not scruple even to sacrifice his favourite Manetho to the greater glorification of his new idol. "Eratosthenes," he says, "corrected throughout, all the deficiencies and blunders which Manetho did not perceive to exist in the Egyptian method in respect to the continuous chronology. The records of the old Empire were in confusion; restorations had been made which contradicted each other. Eratosthenes discovered the only certain clue in the archives of Thebes, where a register was kept of every king, there recognised as such, and how long he reigned. By this means a coherent chronology could be framed, which is exactly what we require."\* Will it be believed that the authority of the writer, thus unhesitatingly ac-

cepted, is liable to the very same exceptions which every reasonable critic must hold to be fatal to the *prima facie* credibility of Manetho;—Eratosthenes being even more remote from the period regarding which he wrote, the original of his history being lost, and the contents being known to us only through the same second-hand and evidently faulty and corrupt compilation—that of George the Syncellus! Even Baron Bunsen himself confesses, that “in the original names, as well as in the Greek version, *numerous* more or less palpable errors of the text are observable,” which, he adds, “can excite but little surprise considering the remote epoch from which they are derived, and how utterly unintelligible they were to the copyists—coupled with the circumstance that we possess but two MSS., to one alone of which any real value attaches.” (I. 117.)

And yet, in the very same breath in which he makes this confession, Baron Bunsen has the incredible hardihood to ask his readers to believe that, on such an authority as this, “not only the number, succession, and for the most part the individual names, but also the whole period of one thousand and seventy-six years in thirty-eight reigns may be assumed beyond all reasonable doubt, as facts distinctly vouched for by Eratosthenes!”

We have been thus minute in describing the principal authorities on which M. Bunsen constructs his scheme of primeval Egyptian history, in order that the reader may be enabled to judge the better of the principles which the same author applies to the comparison of this scheme with the received Biblical history and chronology. The contrast is briefly stated by Mr. Rawlinson in his first Bampton Lecture.

“On the ground that Egypt has a continuous history, commencing more than 6000 years before the Christian era, we are required to reject the literal interpretation of the 6th, 7th and 8th chapters of Genesis, and to believe that the Flood was no more than a great catastrophe in Western Asia, which swept away the inhabitants of that region but left Egypt and the greater part of the world untouched. Ham, we are told, is not a person, but the symbolical representative of Egypt; and he is the elder brother, because Egyptian Hametism is older than Asiatic Semitism. The expression that Canaan is the son of Ham ‘must be interpreted geographically;’ it means, that the Canaanitic tribes which inhabited historical Canaan came from Egypt, where they had pre-

vously had their abode. Nimrod is said to have been begotten by Cush; but he was no more a Cushite by blood than Canaan was an Egyptian; he is called a Cushite, because the people represented by him came from the part of Africa called Cush or Ethiopia (which they had held as conquerors) back into Asia, and there established an empire. Again 'the family tree of Abraham is an historical representation of the great and lengthened migrations of the primitive Asiatic race of man, from the mountains of Armenia and Chaldæa, through Mesopotamia, to the north-east frontier of Egypt, as far as Amalek and Edom. It represents the connection between nations and their tribes, *not personal connection between father and son*, and records consequently epochs, *not real human pedigrees*.' The early Scriptures are devoid altogether of an historical chronology. When the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt is said to have been 430 years, of which one half, or 215 years, was from Abraham's going down into Egypt to Jacob's, the other from Jacob's going down to the Exodus, the number must be regarded as 'conventional and unhistorical;' as 'connected with the legendary genealogies of particular families;' as formed in fact artificially, by a doubling of the first period; which itself only 'represents the traditionary accounts of the primitive times of Canaan as embodied in a genealogy of the three patriarchs,' and 'cannot possibly be worthy of more confidence than the traditions with regard to the second period,' which are valueless. Of course the earlier lists of names and calculations of years are looked upon with still less favour. 'The Jewish tradition, in proportion as its antiquity is thrown back, bears on its face less of a chronological character,' so that 'no light is to be gleaned from it' for general purposes. Even in the comparatively recent times of David and Solomon, there is no coherent or reliable chronology, the round number 40 being still met with, which is taken to be an indubitable sign of arbitrary and artificial arrangement."—Rawlinson, pp. 17-19.

The reader may perhaps be curious to see the process by which M. Bunsen attempts to reconcile this arbitrary system of chronology with the nominal acceptance of the Biblical narrative, and the professed respect for the authority of the Bible. We must make room for a single specimen—that which regards the period of 230 years assigned in Exodus, xii. 40, for the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt.

"The second datum occurs—with reference to the Exodus—(Ex. xii. 40.) in the following parenthetical remark: 'Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years.'

"This statement may seem to originate in the same theory

which forms the foundation of the previous passage, so that the thirty years may be reckoned as the age of the migrating host, they being at the same time called the fifth generation. Or it may be said the latter is the historical, strictly chronological, the former the prophetic form, in which there is no definition of time. Upon either view it is plain that the two data taken literally do not agree, and that they are therefore not strictly chronological. In the first case we could not from the outset expect any strictly chronological date, for none such can be based upon a prophetic announcement. It is certainly very different with the second hypothesis. But in this case the fact of a broad discrepancy in the terms of the tradition as handed down from the remotest period precludes its adoption as the basis of any chronological system. The common text of the Septuagint inserts after 'Egypt' the words '*and in Canaan.*' We shall see in the sequel that according to the genealogies from Abram to Jacob, the earlier sojourn in Canaan is fixed at 215 years; this number, therefore, here clearly forms the basis of the computation, the period from the migration of Abram into Canaan to the Exodus having been considered as ranging itself under two equal divisions, one of which belongs to Canaan, the other to Egypt. But then it should have said—the children of Israel '*and their fathers,*' which is in fact the reading, both of the Alexandrian MS. of the Septuagint, and of the Samaritan version. But no such regular division can ever be historical. Consequently, both the Alexandrian and Samaritan addition must be considered as a license of conjectural criticism, and the preference given to the Hebrew Text. But 430 is exactly the double of the time from Abram's entrance into Canaan down to Jacob's journey into Egypt. The number, therefore, is itself conventional and unhistorical. For it were in our opinion as repugnant to any sound critical view of the passages to suppose that in early times such genealogical lists could have been so parcelled out, that the sum resulting from them should form precisely one half of the 430 historically transmitted years, as to assume the one period to have really been exactly the double of the other. There is no reason why any registers should have been so artificially adjusted, as that the series of years obtained should form precisely one half of the number historically established for the next period. On the contrary, we must consider it the more natural explanation of the passage, to adopt the number 215 as the more ancient. It represents the traditionary accounts of the primitive times of Canaan as embodied in a genealogy of the three patriarchs, which commenced with Abram's migration out of Mesopotamia, and ended with the settlement of Jacob in Egypt. For the period of the sojourn in Egypt there existed neither historical chronology nor even history. There appeared indeed, during the period between Joseph and Moses, no personages of sufficient prominence to furnish materials for genealogical registers. They doubled therefore



the previous patriarchal number for the time of the sojourn in Egypt, as a means of indicating its far longer duration, and gave the latter number the form of an historical sum total without the basis of genealogical registers. Parallel with this sum runs—whether of earlier or later origin may be a question—the prophetic announcement of 400 years and four generations.

“This latter form of the tradition is probably connected with the legendary genealogies of particular families, those of the Levites especially. For almost all of them have three or four branches. But whether these were constructed on the basis of that passage, or whether the chronology of the passage was borrowed from them, in neither case can sound criticism here admit the existence of any element of genuine historical chronology.”—pp. 172-4.

This is, in truth, to apply to the interpretation of the Bible the largest and freest measure of rationalistic liberty. Nor is the liberty confined to this, or a few parallel instances. M. Bunsen has no hesitation in applying it to the whole question of the genealogical and chronological bearings of the Bible narratives. The most sweeping rationalist of the school of Tübingen has never applied the test of naturalism to the miracles of the Gospel, more nakedly than Baron Bunsen employs it in reference to this very question, when he declares that it is difficult to imagine how “those critics who admit the personality and power of Joseph, and the immigration of the sons of Jacob, about 70 persons with their servants, as historical facts, and also the scriptural accounts (Numb. i. 46. comp. xxvi. 51.), according to which the fighting men of 20 years and upwards exceeded 600,000 men at the Exodus—it is difficult to imagine how these critics can consider it an historical fact, that the children of Israel should have quitted Egypt as a nation of more than two millions of souls, at the end of 400 or even 200 years after their settlement.”

We cannot of course think, in a short Article like the present, of following M. Bunsen through any part of the investigation by which he professes to arrive at these conclusions. We must be content with briefly pointing out a few of the most glaring of the many arbitrary and untenable assumptions on which his system rests.

From our summary sketch of those sources of primeval Egyptian history on which he relies and on which he builds a scheme subversive of the Bible narrative, it will

be seen that his sole authorities are the monumental inscriptions and the papyri, interpreted and supplemented by Manetho and Eratosthenes. The two last named authors, indeed, may be truly called the foundation of his chronological system.

Now, let it be borne in mind that, as we have already said, the primeval epoch for the minute chronological details of which these writers are accepted as paramount authority, is separated from both of them by an interval of between three and four thousand years. As independent witnesses for these times, therefore, it is needless to say, they cannot possibly be entitled to the least authority, nor is Baron Bunsen's elaborate panegyric of them entitled to the slightest consideration; inasmuch as no personal qualities, however eminent, nor in truth anything short of inspiration itself, would be a guarantee for the independent credibility of a historian writing upon so remote a period.

Of course it is alleged by M. Bunsen that both Manetho and Eratosthenes, but more especially the latter, derived their information from the tradition of the country, from the monuments and inscriptions, and from the records kept by the priests, and from the archives and registers of the temples. But it is plain that this allegation only shifts the question somewhat further back, leaving the substantial difficulty entirely untouched, as a very brief examination will suffice to show.

No sound critic will believe that either the monuments of Egypt such as we know them to have been, or the national traditions however preserved, or the registers and records of the temples, or all these taken together, could possibly have furnished such details of chronology, so exact an enumeration of the order and duration of reigns, and so complete a scheme of dynasties stretching back for near four thousand years, as M. Bunsen wishes us to accept as established.

In the first place, as regards the monuments of particular monarchs, it is notorious that, even were they far more explicit than they really are, they are totally without significance as parts of any general scheme of chronology, and that they cannot possibly throw any light on the date of particular reigns, or the duration of particular dynasties. They do not include any general era, the events of each reign being dated separately, and no single date of any

reign bearing a determinable relation, whether to any other reign or to any common era. The celebrated series inscribed on the tablets of Abydos and of Karnak, in like manner, are insufficient as a clue to general chronology, and even to the chronology of the period comprised within their own record. It is admitted that the names are not arranged in strict chronological order; and it is also admitted that they are incomplete, and probably arbitrary in their arrangement. But even were it otherwise, it is plain that an engraved series of kings, stretching back to a very remote antiquity, is not a whit more authentic, nor entitled to a shade more of independent credibility from the fact of its being sculptured upon stone, than if it were found in a written record of the same date and of similar origin. Either of them, if emanating from an authentic source, might be decisive as to contemporary, or nearly contemporary, reigns and dynasties; but it is plainly preposterous to claim for either any conclusive authority as to names, dates, reigns, or dynasties, at a distance of two thousand years.

The only rational ground upon which any authority for distant events could be attributed, either to the monumental series of kings and the lists of the papyri, or to the historians Manetho and Eratosthenes, is, that they derived their statements from the temple registers and from the other priestly or kingly archives which are believed to have existed in Egypt. This is the foundation of M. Bunsen's theory regarding them. He opens his account of the sources of Egyptian history as follows.

"Herodotus describes the inhabitants of the cultivated portion of Egypt as the best informed or most learned of mankind. In one of his lost works Theophrastus used the same expression regarding them, and evidently also with reference to the high antiquity of their traditions. The reason assigned by Herodotus for so characterising them, is their rigid adherence to these traditions; in other words, the exactness with which they maintained ancient usage and the remembrance of the past. Although there is here no direct allusion to their familiarity with the dates and history of their nation, still it is clear from the whole tenour of the second book, that he had devoted great attention to their historical and chronological tradition, and that even where it appeared to him improbable or barely credible, he yet retails it, as worthy of the serious consideration of his readers.

"'No Egyptian,' he remarks (ii. 82.), 'omits taking accurate

note of extraordinary or striking events.' Manetho observes, in agreement with all the Greek annalists, that the Egyptians possessed uninterrupted descriptions of their kings from Menes downwards. Herodotus (ii. 99. seqq.) was also acquainted with lists of kings kept by the priests, in which the events and monuments of each reign were recorded: from one of these they read to him the names of 330 kings, successors of Menes (ii. 100.) Diodorus enters more into detail as to the nature of these lists or annals of the priests, although his information, as we shall see, is less accurate. 'The priests,' he says in the introduction to that part of his work which treats of Egyptian history (i. 44.), 'had in their sacred books, transmitted from the olden time, and handed down by them to their successors in office, written descriptions of all their kings,' (from the time of the fabulous monarchs, called heroes, to that of the Ptolemies). 'In these an account is given of every king—of his physical powers and disposition, and of the exploits of each in the order of time.' Artaxerxes in his expedition through the country, carried off these descriptions from the archives of the Temple; Bagoas, his lieutenant, afterwards restored them to the priests for a large sum of money. It was in these 'descriptions,' or at least in works compiled from them, that Theophrastus found his account of an emerald of immense size, which a king of Babylon had on some occasion sent with other objects of great value to a king of Egypt—probably Nechao.

"The lists of Manetho and Eratosthenes, which have come down to us, profess, and with truth, as their own internal evidence shows, to have been derived from these royal annals. In these annals, as we shall see, were entered the names of each king, together with his stature, the date of his reign, notices of its more remarkable events or prodigies, and doubtless of his lineage, birth, and age. Concurrent with them, according to the same authorities, was another source of historical tradition, namely, songs or lays, which do not seem to have been limited to mere popular ballads, but to have comprised also hymns of a purely sacred or sacerdotal character. 'With regard to Sesoösis,' says Diodorus (i. 53.), 'not only is there a disagreement among Greek writers, but the priests also, and those who praise him in their songs, vary in their statements.' Manetho also, in his history of the nineteenth dynasty, according to the extracts of Josephus, to be examined more closely in the sequel, quotes popular legends, which he expressly characterises as such, and the authenticity of which consequently he does not pretend to warrant."—pp. 1-4.

Now this, undoubtedly, looks exceedingly imposing; and, as regards the periods during which this system prevailed in Egypt, it is clear that the records so kept would supply a body of information as reliable as could be desired for most of the purposes of national history and chronology.

Hence for the times of Herodotus, and probably for many centuries immediately preceding his time, it may be reasonably believed that the temple archives and other sacerdotal records contained a detailed and continuous catalogue of the Kings of Egypt, from which it would be easy to construct, for that period, such lists of the royal series as we find in Manetho, and in the Turin Papyrus or the tablets of Karnak or Abydos. But it is a very different thing as regards the remote and legendary period into which the speculations of M. Bunsen carry us back. In order that for these times the temple registers should supply any authority whatsoever, it would be necessary to show that the system of records described by Herodotus and Diodorus, extended back into those times, for which, we need hardly say, there is not a shadow of evidence, or even of conjectural probability. It is true that the lists of the kings which the priests exhibited did reach back into these pretended periods; but they were so palpably fabulous in their character that it is only the most wilful blindness or the wildest credulity that could for a moment regard them as possessing any historical value. The later periods no doubt are genuine and historical in them all; but they all begin with the mythological period; they all extend far back into the region of fable; and (what ought to be fatal to their strictly chronological character, even in the historical period,) the succession is as precisely maintained, the order and duration of reigns is as exactly registered, in the purely fabulous, as in what we know to be the strictly historical, epoch. Thus, to take the authority of Herodotus, as cited by Baron Bunsen. If the priests, as Baron Bunsen takes care to tell, read for Herodotus\* "from a papyrus, the names of 330 monarchs, who, they said, were the successors of Menes on the throne;" they also told him with equally minute chronological precision, (what Baron Bunsen does not think it necessary to dwell upon,) that it was precisely "17,000 years before the reign of Amasis that the twelve gods were produced from the eight!" Nor is this a solitary example. In another place† Herodotus says that "from Pan to Amasis the priests counted a still longer time; and even from Bacchus, who is the youngest of the three, they

\* II. c. 100. Rawlinson's Herodotus, ii. p. 80.

† II. 145. Rawlinson, ii. p. 226.

reckon 15,000 years to the reign of that king." But what is most important of all, as illustrating the true value of those sacerdotal registers which Baron Bunsen makes the foundation of all Egyptian history, and for which he would have us set aside the Bible narrative itself, the priests professed to Herodotus that even in these (plainly fabulous) details the temple records were of infallible authority, "as they have always kept count of the years and noted them in their registers."\*

In like manner Diodorus† tells us that the Egyptians kept registers of their kings, beginning with the gods and heroes, and coming down to his own time. And, in point of fact, according to the lists of Manetho, the gods reigned upon earth before men, and his lists include these reigns of the gods. The same is true, (although the series is not complete,) for the list of the Turin Papyrus; and in a word, nothing can be plainer than that these catalogues of the Egyptian kings, can only be regarded in the same light as the similar ancient records of all other nations,—a compound of the historical and the legendary, and that to accept them in their integrity, and to adopt their very earliest details as purely historical, simply because we know the latter portion to be such in the strictest sense of the word, would be to endorse as genuine the wildest fables of early Grecian and Roman, or even of Indian and Chinese history.

And hence, to return to the question of the credibility of Eratosthenes, as founded on the opportunities of research, which his acquaintance with the royal and sacerdotal archives must have supplied;—it is clear that Eratosthenes is, on this ground, entitled to credit, solely to the same extent to which his materials can be regarded as trustworthy. The question must still remain, at what point these materials, that is to say the lists, (which are certainly fabulous in part,) cease to be fabulous, and begin to be historical. In determining this, the authority of Eratosthenes, as such, is simply that of a critic, possessing whatever of weight his own personal qualifications may lend to it; but it is not that of a witness, nor can it be considered history in any legitimate sense of the name. It does not follow that because Livy had access to the *Libri Lintei* we must accept as histo-

\* Rawlinson, ii. p. 226. † I. cap. 44



rical his narrative of the early centuries of Roman history ; and the catalogues of the Egyptian dynasties, following out a lengthened succession from Menes down to the Ptolemies, may be not inaptly likened to the Irish chronicles, which carry back their entries with the same unvarying air of serious reality, from the year in which they were written, to the days of Partholanus, in the fourth century after the Flood, and even to those of Cesara, the niece of Noah himself !

We have already disclaimed the intention of attempting, within the very limited space at our disposal, to enter into any of the specific difficulties of Egyptian chronology. But we must briefly notice before we close, one example of M. Bunsen's method of dealing with the ancient authorities, and of his arbitrary manner of reasoning, even upon the vague and uncertain chronological data which they supply.

It is hardly necessary to inform the reader that the scheme of Egyptian history derived from Manetho supposes, according to the account of it given in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, a period of nearly 30,000 years before the Christian era. The difficulty, however, arising from this enormous total, is more apparent than real ; for, upon examination of the items which it comprises, we find that nearly 25,000 years out of the 30,000, belong to a period plainly legendary, inasmuch as the latest division of it comprises the period of *Manes and Heroes*. Hence the earlier periods must be classed with the fabulous times of Babylonian, Indian, and Chinese history ; and the only historical difficulty which remains to be explained will regard the time at which history may be supposed to commence, viz., that which dates from Menes, and includes the thirty dynasties of Manetho—a period of about 5000 years. It is unnecessary to advert to the various suggestions which have been made for the purpose of bringing the account of Manetho's dynasties into harmony with the Bible chronology—as for example the hypothesis that several of the dynasties recorded by him were not successive, but contemporaneous, and therefore that the sum of 5000 years, which is obtained by adding together the years of the several reigns, considered as successive, is a grievous exaggeration. Our real object in referring to it is rather to illustrate Baron Bunsen's general method, than to examine this particular difficulty. The Baron's theory

of the age of the world would not be by any means satisfied with the full sum of 5000 years claimed for Manetho's dynasties, considered as successive; nor does he himself in point of fact regard them as such. He claims for the human race a far higher antiquity, arguing upon entirely independent grounds derived from his theory of the growth of language; and according to him the Deluge must be placed about 10,000 years before the birth of Christ, and the creation of man about as much earlier. In accordance with the requirements of this hypothesis, he naturally seeks to throw back the historical period to as early a date as possible, and to make room within the strict limits of history for as large a number of real events and real personages as may be reconcilable with the authorities.

Let us see, then, how he proceeds. According to the transcript of Eusebius, Manetho's account was as follows:\*

"The gods reigned	...	...	13,900
After the gods reigned the <i>Heroes</i>	...	...	1,255
And again <i>other kings</i> reigned	...	...	1,817
Then other <i>thirty Memphite kings</i>	...	...	1,790
Then other <i>ten Thinite kings</i>	...	...	350
Then followed the rule of <i>Manes and Heroes</i>	...	...	5,813
Then followed <i>thirty dynasties</i> from <i>Menés to Nectanebo the Younger.</i> "			

It is plain from the order in which these several items succeed each other, that, whereas it is argued by all sound Egyptologists that the historic period begins with Menes, all the items before the thirty dynasties, must belong to the legendary time, as indeed is sufficiently indicated by the very names *Manes and Heroes*, by which the entry before Menes is described.

Not so, however, according to Baron Bunsen. Commenting on Eusebius's account of Manetho, he says:

"The Demi-Gods or Heroes were probably also again divided into two classes—the period of the former lasted 1255 years. Eusebius united the period of the latter to the dominion of the Manes, probably in the way of supplement, having found them necessary to make up the eleven centuries. Those Manes then form the transition to historical Kings, but were not Kings of the Empire of Egypt, for the ancestor of these last was Menes, who

---

\* See Appendix, vol. i. pp. 607-8.

united the Upper and Lower Country. They may rather be classed as provincial Princes prior to the union, which raised Memphis to the rank of second city in the Empire, next to the primeval sacred Thebes, and eclipsed Abydos. Menes himself was of the Thinite race, and the Thinites are really the last in our series. Before (or conjointly with them) there were of course Kings of Lower Egypt, and these are here described as Memphites, according to the later mode of expression; inaccurately, however, for Menes was the founder of the city of Memphis. Thus, as the former Thinites were the ancestors of Menes, so were the latter probably the ancestors of the oldest Memphite Kings of the Empire, who, on the extinction of the Thinite race in the male line, at the close of the second century of the history of the Empire, ascended the Throne of Egypt. But in Eusebius 'other kings,' who are said to have reigned 1817 years, precede both those Dynasties of primeval Memphite and Thinite Kings. These were, likewise, it may be assumed, provincial Kings of the primeval history—probably Thebans.

"The following, therefore, may be considered as the substance of Manetho's system—

1. Dominion of Gods in two divisions, the first of which ended with Horus, the second with Bitys	...	...	13,900 years.
2. Dominion of Heroes in two divisions	...	...	1,255
3. Heroes and Kings of the primeval Race—transition from divine to human history	...	...	5,813
4. Purely human history—provincial Princes:			
a. Kings without particular notices (of Thebes ?)	...	1817	3,957
b. Thirty Memphites (Lower Egypt)	...	1790	
c. Ten Thinites	...	350	
Sum total	...	24,925 yrs."	

By this ingenious transposition, Baron Bunsen transfers to the *human period* nearly 4000 years. By placing after "the transition from divine to human history" the three items—

Kings without particular notices	...	...	1817
Thirty Memphites,	...	...	1790
Ten Thinites	...	...	350

he gains for his theory no less than 3,957 years!

We need not say not only that there is not the shadow of authority in the original of Eusebius for this transposition, but even that it contradicts the order suggested by the very nature of the case itself. M. Bunsen places

immediately after the gods *Manes* and Heroes, after whom come *human* personages. Now the idea of *Manes* or spirits of *deceased men*, necessarily involves the pre-existence of men upon the earth.

The result, however, falls in most conveniently with his pre-conceived hypothesis, and enables him to conclude that "the following points remain historically certain—that as regards the human period, the old Egyptian tradition recognised historical royal families, and individual sovereigns prior to Menes. They were separated from the divine founders of the nation by the sacred princes of the primeval times, who were said to have reigned several thousand years. No family name however is assigned to their more ancient sovereigns—they may therefore have been elective monarchs, chosen by the Priests—a form still maintained, as remarked in our first chapter, in later historical times. But as regards the purely Mythological Dynasties, there is no reason to believe that Manetho reduced the period of the Gods, still less the whole period prior to Menes, to Sothiac cycles, of 1461 years each, or to any other class of Egyptian astronomical periods." (I. pp. 73-4).

We have left ourselves but little space to discuss the very startling facts brought forward by Mr. Leonard Horner, in his paper read before the Royal Society, as to the discovery of remains of pottery in the alluvial soil of the Valley of the Nile, at such a depth below the surface as to suggest the inference that the existence of men upon this earth dates back to a period far beyond what is consistent with the Bible narrative. This is a subject which will come more naturally for discussion at some future time, in connexion with the alleged discovery of "works of art in the drift," by M. Boucher de Perthes, in France,\* and by Mr. Prestwich, and several others in England. For the present, in order to show how rash and illogical are the conclusions drawn by Mr. Horner, and unhesitatingly accepted by Baron Bunsen,† it will be enough to state the facts as alleged by M. Bunsen. It will at once appear how far these facts are from warranting such a conclusion.

---

\* *Antiquités Celtiques et Auto-diluviennes.* Paris, 1847.

† Vol. iii. pref. xxvii.

Mr. Horner states that in the course of some borings on the site of the ancient Memphis, the boring instrument brought up from a depth of thirty-nine feet below the surface, a fragment of pottery, which is now in his possession. Now, by Mr. Horner's calculation, the rate at which the alluvial deposit increases at that point of the course of the Nile, is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  inches in the century. Hence he infers, that since the presence of pottery supposes the existence of man, and since, in order to account for an accumulation of thirty-nine feet, at least 13,371 must be supposed to have elapsed, the Valley of the Nile must have been peopled by a race of men who had made some progress in civilization from a period between fourteen and fifteen thousand years before the present century.

Now it is hardly necessary to point out how many assumptions utterly unproved, and indeed incapable of proof, are involved in Mr. Horner's conclusion.

In the first place, his calculation of the rate of increase, is made on the assumption that because the upper level of the platform on which the colossal statue of Rameses II. at Memphis originally stood is now 9 feet 4 inches below the surface, therefore the deposit of the Nile has been but 9 feet 4 inches since the date of Rameses II. Now this is clearly false. Such a statue must necessarily have stood considerably, probably several feet, above the general surface of the ground on which it was erected. Even the platform on which it stood must have been much elevated above the general surface, in order to allow for the periodical rising of the river, as well as for architectural effect. Hence the actual depth of deposit must have been considerably above 9 feet 4 inches.

In the second place, Mr. Horner's calculation assumes the rate of increase in the deposit to have been uniform throughout this enormous period of thirteen thousand years; and he excludes the idea of any extraordinary or abnormal inundation or inundations, in the progress of which a much larger deposit may have taken place, and by which in the course of a few years might have been accumulated what in ordinary circumstances would be the work of silent centuries. Such an assumption is, of course, entirely gratuitous. Who can undertake to say that many such abnormal deposits may not have actually occurred?

Again, the argument assumes that the fragment of pottery thus found, must have been covered in its present

state by the slow process of deposit. This again is a still more gratuitous assumption. Is it not equally possible that the spot in which this fragment was found, was the site of some ancient well, water-tank, or other excavation? It is notorious that, for the purposes of irrigation, tanks, ponds, and other excavations abounded in the Valley of the Nile from the earliest period. The artificial lake of Moeris is a familiar example, although on the very largest scale, and one of the most elaborate chapters of M. Bunsen's work is devoted to the investigation of the site of this celebrated reservoir. The bottom of such excavations was, of course, many feet below the general level of the plain in which they were situated. Hence an object thrown into such a reservoir at the time at which we suppose the deposit to begin to accumulate, would in reality be many feet below the level of a contemporaneous object on the surface of the plain. Now it is notorious that in such reservoirs the deposit is far more rapid than on the plain, and experience proves that a very short period suffices to fill them up to the general level of the surrounding country. Hence, until it is shown that the spot on which Mr. Horner's fragment was found, was not the site of some ancient excavation, the depth of this fragment below the surface can never be taken as an evidence of the depth of the general level at the date which the pottery was deposited.

And even putting aside these artificial excavations, is it not most natural, that in the various changes which, as is historically certain, the course of the Nile has undergone, and the consequent variations of level within short distances in the same place, the finding of fragments of pottery, and such other evidences of human habitation, at this or that depth, must of its own nature be a most uncertain argument of the time at which it was deposited at this particular level? Is it not perfectly possible, that since the sediment would necessarily accumulate more rapidly in the lower level, we might find within short distances of each other, two relics deposited in precisely the same year, nevertheless at very different depths below the present surface level?

We might easily suggest numberless other equally possible explanations of Mr. Horner's piece of pottery. We shall only add, that, until these and many similar possi-



bilities and probabilities shall have been disproved, his conclusion cannot be deemed worth the fragment of pottery upon which it is founded.

---

*Note to Art. VIII. No. 89.—Appeal in Criminal Cases.*

It will be remembered that in our 89th No., we devoted an article to the above subject. The trials of Smethurst and others during the last year have now so fixed attention on it, that we entertain sanguine hopes of soon seeing the views we calmly advocated, on the abstract principles of justice, and without the excitement caused by these trials, enrolled in the Statute Book. It appears that on the first night of the Session Mr. McMahon gave notice of his intention to introduce "a Bill to secure a right of appeal in criminal cases," and on the second day introduced it without opposition, when the Home Secretary made the following observations.

"Sir G. Cornewall Lewis:—The hon. member has correctly stated that there is no intention on the part of her Majesty's Government to oppose the introduction of a bill of this kind. The subject is not one of a political character, and it has attracted of late a good deal of public attention. It is one which, I think, properly deserves the attention of the House, and I trust it will receive the attention of both sides of the House, independent of all political consideration. (Hear, hear.) It is obviously a subject in which no party interest is involved. (Hear, hear.) It is a matter in which the whole community has a common interest. I will not now anticipate the discussion that must occur on the second reading, but I wish it should be understood that in making no opposition to the introduction of the Bill which has been introduced to the attention of the House, I am by no means to be understood as giving my assent to the principles which may be embodied in the Bill."

Sir Fitzroy Kelly, who so long back as 1844, first introduced the subject to the House, has also given notice of another Bill for the same object, and we have reason to think that another Hon. Member has also a Bill in preparation for the same purpose. It will therefore be very extraordinary, if the law do not undergo a thorough revision, and this stain on its general excellence be not removed.

According to the present practice, as exemplified in Dr. Smethurst's case, the Home Secretary, on his own authority, without the power of examining a witness on oath, sets aside the deliberate judgment of a jury, and one of the highest judges in the land. This practice enables a man, who fears to call witnesses in court because they may break down on cross examination, to take the chance of an

acquittal without calling them, and then if he is convicted, to call them, or rather to send their unsworn statements before the Home Secretary, who must run the risk of public odium if he firmly discharges his duty and pays no more attention to these statements than the jury would have paid to the sworn evidence of the parties themselves, if they had been confronted in open court with the witnesses for the prosecution. We advocate this change as much for the sake of preventing the escape of the guilty as of securing the acquittal of the innocent. So far, however, as Mr. Mc.Mahon's proposal is concerned, it has, after an important debate, been rejected; and we cannot say that we dissent from many of the objections which were urged against his scheme. The fate of this Bill certainly jeopardizes any probability of any legislation on the subject in the present Session; but we must record our protest against the continuance of the existing system, which throws an undue and unreasonable responsibility on the executive Government, and fails to satisfy the public as to the grounds on which a convict may have received a free pardon; and it would be an abuse of terms to say that a free pardon can ever be equivalent to an acquittal. We incline to support the suggestion of one of our cotemporaries (we think the *Saturday Review*) of allowing a new trial in criminal cases to take place only on the Certificate of the Home Office, that there are grounds for a reinvestigation before a Jury. The result of such a trial would, in our view, remove the main objections to the existing system.

---

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*Hebrew Lyrics*. By an Octogenarian. London: Saunders, Otley and Co., 1859.

Who says that the love for poetry has died out in the country since the introduction of steam? We do not believe that the rapid development of the physical sciences and the consequent growth of material industry have destroyed the poetic element in the national mind. There is, on the contrary, an increasing demand for works of the imagination, and more especially for poetry of a religious character. We cannot say, however, that the supply comes up to the high standard of excellence we have a right, in

an age that boasts so much of its own enlightenment, to exact from our writers of poetry. What shall we say in praise of poetic merit when in "Sea-dreams," his most recent effusion, we find the Poet Laureate imposing upon a too credulous public, verses which possess neither point, nor imagination, nor even beauty of language. From Tennyson we have a prescriptive right to expect glitter at least, if not pure gold. In the present excited state of men's minds, disturbed by rumours of wars and by political passions, it is a wise and profitable work to lead all whom we can influence to the contemplation of calmer and purer subjects. Poetry is one of the agents destined, even in this age, to work out the designs of Him who inspired the Royal Minstrel of the Hebrew race. Religious poetry has had in all ages a marvellous hold on the human heart. We can well imagine how the Psalms of David, grand in their simple force, exercised so potent a sway over the souls of God's chosen people. We always witness with joy and welcome every fresh endeavour to spread abroad and unfold the hidden beauties of the inspired Psalmist. In every succeeding version some remote allusion that has escaped notice, or some casual expression that throws light on an obscure or dubious passage is traced out or more closely examined. Some translators give a strict and literal, and even a bald rendering of the original, while other some, like our author, trusting more to the spirit than to the letter, take a freer scope and indulge in a more varied version with sonorous rhythm and metre. The student of the great Psalmist will be equally grateful to each class of translators, and make use of both the free and the literal version as acceptable guides in his difficult study, for they will bring out, by their contrast, the meaning of the original, and supply mutual deficiencies.

The author of the "Hebrew Lyrics" attributes, in his preface, the failure of so many of his predecessors in the work of a poetic rendering of the Psalms to a too rigid adherence to the letter of the original. However this may be, and whatever the estimate we may form of his own measure of success, it cannot be denied that our author has combined with wonderful energy and indomitable perseverance, an evident relish for his work, which alone could have enabled him to complete his arduous undertaking. What perhaps surprises us most is the enthusiastic ardour infused into every page by one who has reached, as

the title page informs us, but which otherwise we never should have guessed, an almost patriarchal length of days. In this manifest labour of love there is abundant evidence of an elaborate finish, as if the Horatian maxim "*Nonum prematur in annum*," had been observed by the author, and which an elegant and cultivated mind alone could have bestowed. We regret that our space forbids us giving copious extracts or the entire reproduction of some of the more beautiful of these numerous Lyrics. The following is the commencement of the 53rd Lyric :—

"What fool is there has inly said,  
Or outwardly has muttered,  
'There is no God, of live nor dead ;  
And if not here,  
Why should we fear  
The threats He never utter'd ?'

"As senseless doctrine as abrupt  
Of dulness detestable.  
But man's grown totally corrupt,  
And from the way  
Gone quite astray,  
A graceless 'miserable.'

"From loftiest pinnacle of Heaven  
To Earth's profound abysses  
God looked to see if there was even  
One, only one  
No ill had done,  
But still that man He misses.

"Nor one there is, through all the length  
And breadth of His dominions,  
That has not given his health and strength  
And faculties  
To idolize  
Gods of his own opinions."

We quote, in conclusion, the last stanza of the 17th Lyric, on the desire of amassing the wealth and treasures of the world :—

"But as for me as I grow old  
What pleasure can these give ?  
Who long Thy Presence to behold ;  
For this alone I live ;

And tho' the present scene would seem  
The fever of a fitful dream,  
As false as fugitive,  
Soon shall it shift to other place,  
And I behold Thee face to face."

We can well conceive with what patriarchal benevolence our author regards this generation, which he has watched growing up into strength beneath his eyes, and with what kindness of purpose and piety he has bequeathed to us as a legacy his "Hebrew Lyrics."

II.—*The Cyclopædia of Anatomy and Physiology*. Edited by R. B. Todd, M.D., F.R.S. Five vols. in vi. 8vo. London, 1855—59.

England, which gave Harvey to the world, has hitherto produced no great systematic original work on Physiology. Our best elementary works on this most interesting subject have hitherto been translations out of foreign tongues. Almost the only comprehensive work on physiology which we possess by an Englishman, that of the late learned and accurate Dr. Bostock,\* is rather critical and historical than actual and practical. The great Gottingen Professor, Alb. von Haller, is the sun in the physiological firmament of Bostock; he himself had little but certain small chemical researches to add to the current information of his day. Though much longer, more elaborate, and learned, the amount of actual physiological lore contained in Bostock's three volumes amounts, in fact, to little more than may be found in the elegant and compendious *Conspectus Medicinæ Theoreticæ* of Dr. James Gregory of Edinburgh. The time, indeed, had not yet come when a great elementary work on physiology was possible in any country, least of all in England. The world had not yet had the physical revelations of Schleiden and Schwann, of Dutrochet and Liebig; and among ourselves in especial, whilst the northerns were ringing monotonous changes on the purely hypothetical ideas of Cullen, the southerners appeared to find all they required in the shadowy speculations of Hunter. It would seem, indeed, that even great

---

\* *An Elementary System of Physiology*, by John Bostock, M.D. 3 vols. London, 1823. Second Edition, London, 1828.

men are not always an undivided good in this world. Cullen paralysed the genius of Scottish medical inquiry for half a century ; and in London to call in question the dicta or presumed dicta (for, like other oracles, he spoke obscurely,) of John Hunter, was to be guilty not only of an intellectual error, but almost of a moral delinquency. Physiology, indeed, apart from its application to practical medicine, has only of late years formed an essential element in the curriculum of medical study. It used in former times to be but superficially taught in our colleges, under the head of "Theory of Medicine," whilst now, associated with structural or general anatomy, it forms one of the most carefully considered courses in every medical school.

We have had then no original systematic work on physiology in English ; but in the great Cyclopædia, the title of which we have given above, we can boast a series of papers by the most eminent British and some foreign physiologists, on every subject that can interest an inquirer into the nature of the organisms that compose the animal kingdom, and their various and complicated functions,—exhaustive disquisitions on the mechanism and mystery of animal life and being. An Herculean task, truly ! carefully if somewhat slowly achieved ; an enduring memorial to the patience, science, and taste of the editor, the announcement of whose awfully sudden death we read while we are correcting the press ;—a fearful loss to the world of science and medicine. When to that distinguished name we add the names of Alison, Bowman, Allen Thomson, Rymer Jones, M. Dutrochet, W. F. Edwards, Carpenter, Willis, and Owen, as among the number of the contributors, we have done enough to proclaim our own appreciation of the work, and to direct the attention of our readers, and all whom it may concern—and whom does it *not* concern to know by what laws he lives, and moves, and has his being?—to this great national work now happily completed.



## INDEX TO VOL. XLVII.

- Academy*, Irish 25.  
*Adam Bede*, extracts 34.  
*Agriculture* in Algeria 308—at the monastery of Staoheli 326—and at Jemappes 127.  
*Algeria*, French colony there ill regarded by us 274—its former condition *ib.*—great good doing there by France 276—absolute toleration in religion enforced 278—beauty and wealth of the country 280—relics of ancient Christianity there 282—five races that inhabit it 283—their numbers 290—French government of 302—progress of colonization in it 305, 313—useful works in 305—recommended to travellers 324.  
*Anouit*, Count, his assassination 206.  
*Arabs*, the, in Algeria 286—the great difficulty of the French 291.  
*Army*, the French 305—its useful accomplishments in Algeria 305.  
*Bel-Ombre*, garden of 307.  
*Beluga*, species of whale in the arctic regions 343.  
*Board* of National Education in Ireland 355—the last of the Catholic bishops gave up his seat in it 358—encourages proselytism 371—regulations permitted which have that effect 373—injustice of their discouragement of conventual schools 381—encourage model schools to the detriment of others 385—admit the giving Protestant religious school books to Catholic children 395—is constituted with a majority of Protestants 397—oppressive to Catholic teachers 400—strike out part of Mr. Keenan's report on the working of the schools in Ulster 403—worthlessness of their justification 406.  
*Books*, notices of 364, 338.  
—given in the Irish national schools 395.  
*Bourbon*, the house of 113.  
*Bugeaud*, Marshal, his exploits in Algeria 304, 319.  
*Bunsen*, Baron, his work upon Egyptian history 501, 505—his comments upon the meagreness of the monumental inscriptions 507, 515—yet tries to supersede by them the Bible history 508—proceeds upon monumental inscriptions, the Papyri and the authority of Manetho 509, 518—his panegyric upon Eratosthenes 520—his version of Bible history 522—how reconciled with his professed respect 523.  
—Baron, his opinions controverted 526, 528—extract from 527—his chronology of the world, 532.  
*Bureau* Arabes 302.  
*Burke*, Sir Bernard 111.  
*Butler*, William Archer, his sermon upon education 353.  
*Carlyle*, Mr., his history of Frederick the Great 132—his sketch of German history 134—his theories 136—extravagances 137—instances, *ib.*—his omissions of facts 146—perversion of judgment 157, 159, 162.  
*Castren*, traveller amongst the Samojedes 333—his reception in one of their tents 336.  
*Catholic*, unfairness shown to them in the education of their children 404—what course they should take in regard to the national education system 435—training schools 436—publication of books 437—should form a Catholic educational society 440.  
*Ceylon*, island of, its natural wealth 448—evidences of its ancient civilization 449—population 450—legends concerning 454—sketch of its history 456—progress of Christianity under the Portuguese 457—the island is assumed by the English 465—immoral conduct of the governor *ib.*—its present good secure government 468.  
*Christian Brothers*, their schools 382.  
*Church*, Catholic, in Portugal 46—the priests entangled with the Free Mason Lodges 47—miserable condition at present 71, 75—men promoted purposely to her disgrace 72—her only hope at present in the people 73—life of her patriarch attempted 77.  
*Cities* of Romagna, their municipal privileges 171—forfeit them by their claim to political independence *ib.*—late revolutions in them effected by foreign ruffians 204, 211—rights recovered of forgotten cities in Algeria 300.  
*Code* Napoleon, the, its effect upon liberty 321.  
*Colonists* in Algeria perpetually interfered with 315.  
*Commerce*, French regulations for in Algeria 308.  
*Conscription*, the, its effect upon the French population 320.  
*De Dominis*, Antonio, life of 97, 99, 100—circumstances leading to his apostasy as described by Dr. Newland 101, 103—resigns his See in favour of a relative *ib.*—goes to England 105—reception there *ib.*—his preferences and avaricious behaviour 107—*ib.* is entrapped into a recantation 108—returns to Rome 109—insincerity and death *ib.*  
*Dublin*, city of 2—history of 3—Hoey's court 4—Castle street *ib.*—Warburgh street 5—Fish-

shamble street 6—Hell 10—High street 11—  
theatres 14—bank 24—Grafton street 23.  
*Dutch*, the, their meanness in Ceylon 458, 460—  
their influence contrasted with that of the  
Portuguese 462—at home made the Catholics  
profitable 1b.—persecuted them in Ceylon 463  
Dutch power in Ceylon brought to a close by  
the East India Company 464.

*Education in Algeria* 296—endeavours of states  
to get direction of 346—views of Napoleon  
concerning it 347—of Louis Philippe 1b.—the  
Republic in France grants it liberty 1b.—par-  
liamentary debate upon it in 1839, 348.

— in Ireland gradually passing into  
the hands of the Catholics 384—mixed system  
of failing in the colonies 349—in England the  
state has given up its authority over 350—to  
be free must be unaided 1b.—how far Ireland  
is prepared for this 1b.—extracts from a Pro-  
testant sermon upon 353—system of intro-  
duced in 1831, 354—opposition of the Catholic  
bishops to it 351, 355—objections of the Synod  
of Thurles 357—changes in the national sys-  
tem of 363—as to combined religious instruc-  
tion 1b.—in the books supplied 365—the  
interference of priests prevented 370—other  
important alterations 376—each Catholic  
parent must now lodge separate objections to  
each dangerous book 379—is almost entirely  
carried on by Protestants 397—the whole  
system now forced upon Ireland 421—reforms  
absolutely required to make the system  
available for Catholics 442.

— in Ireland at present more material  
than formerly 438—in some respects de-  
teriorated under the national system 439.

— Denominational, objections made to  
it 422—arguments in favour of 427.

*Egypt*, its ancient monuments 502—its history  
to be re-written from them 503, 505—great  
men who have carried on the investigation  
504—meagreness of the inscriptions 507—  
antiquity of the use of writing in 509—more  
important records 511.

*Egyptians*, early, possessed books 510—which  
have not been preserved 511—the papyrus  
514.

*Elephants* 448.

*England*, the peace of the country maintained  
in it by force 175—her jealousy of continental  
powers 276.

— a great appropriator of islands 445—  
her obligations to Holland 1b.

*English*, the, meanness of their conduct in  
Ceylon 465.

*Eratosthenes* 520.

*Erodius Papyri* present many curious corroborations  
of Scripture 517.

*Families*, vicissitudes of, how caused in England  
and Ireland 112—how in France 113—of the  
House of Bourbon 1b.

*Faulkner*, George 13.

*Fishermen*, in Ceylon and in India, the earliest  
converts to the Catholic Faith 463.

*Foundling Hospitals* 39—in Paris 41.

*Frederick William*, King of Prussia, Carlyle's  
description of 146—his directions to his son's  
instructors 150—his regiment of giants 154—  
his treatment of his son and daughter 155—  
of Katto 156—his death 163.

*Frederick the Great*, his letter upon his mar-  
riage 159—rude treatment of his sister 161—  
his literary acquaintance 163.

*French*, the, commencement of their attack  
upon Algeria 277—how drawn on to their  
present position 1b.—political consequences of  
their occupation of Algeria 279—their diffi-  
culties 283—mistake to expel the Turks 285—  
their influence lessened by the love of revolu-  
tion 292—carry their toleration of Mahom-  
metanism too far 294—unfaithful to their  
own religion 296—their promotion of educa-  
tion 297—have made themselves Arabic  
scholars 299—their explorations of Arabic  
literature 300—their administration of justice  
301—their useful works 305—introduction of  
gardens 307—encouragement of agriculture  
308—regulations of commerce 1b.—tiresome  
and interfering laws 315—conscription 320.

*Gautherot*, infallible in finding water 307.

*Geese* wild, hunting them 339.

*Gentry*, the Irish, their disappearance in the  
years of famine 116—how composed 117—  
their character 1b.

*Gilbert Mr.*, 2—his history of Dublin 4, 30.

*Greece*, kingdom of 84—its parliament 85—the  
robber party 86.

*Greeks*, the character of 84—their desire of  
union and independence 86.

*Hall-i-Humayoon* the, its provisions cannot be  
carried out 94.

*Hell Street* in Dublin 10.

*Heraldry* 125.

*Herodotus*, new translation of, 506.

*Hierarchy*, Irish Catholic, their pastoral upon  
education 351—have frequently protested  
against the changes in the Irish system 356—  
conditions they required 1b.—their resolu-  
tions refused by the Lord Lieutenant 357—  
had never done more than agree to try the  
mixed system 358—encouraged by papal  
rescript 1b.—protest against vesting schools  
385.

*High Street*, Dublin 11.

*Hoc's Court* Dublin 4.

*Holland*, great supporter of protestantism 445.

*Horner Mr.*, his theory from the pottery found  
in the valley of the Nile 534.

*Infanticide* crime of, common in England 39.

*Inspectors* of schools for the Irish National  
Board, unfair selection of them 398.

*Instruction* religious, introduced in the national  
schools at improper times 363.

*Ireland*, how far prepared to make sacrifices for  
free education 350.

*Islamism* in Algeria 295.

*Ivory*, of bones of primeval animals 341.

*Jacobinism*, definition of, by Burke 348.

*Jemappes*, French colony at 327.

*Jesuits*, their expulsion from Portugal by  
Pombal 48—their return 59—again expelled  
60.

*Jews*, held in contempt in Algeria 283.

*Julius II.*, Pope, suppresses the Vicars of the  
Church 172.

*Justice*, courts of, in Algeria 301.

*Kabyles* the, race inhabiting Algeria 288.

*Karnack*, Royal series of, description of the  
site where it was found 511—controversies  
concerning 513.

*Kavanagh Mr.*, his work on education, Catholic  
case stated 362.

*Kober-Koumia*, monument in Algeria 300.

- Lambesa*, ancient city of, 282, 288.  
*Leo X.*, puts down tyrannical governors of towns 172.  
*Lepsius*, interpreter of the Egyptian papyri 504.  
*Library*, of Mafra 51.  
*Lisbon*, frightful condition of 48—awful warning 49.  
*Literature* Arabic, translated by the French 299—first notice of any amongst the blacks 299.  
*McCrith Dr.*, his capture by Greek bandits 87.  
*Manetho*, Egyptian Philosopher 518—an authority not to be relied upon ib.  
*Marcedo*, Padre Jose de, great loss in his death 75.  
*Margaret Maultsche*, heiress of the Tyrol 142.  
*Martin* of Comnema, family of 118—fate of the last heiress 121.  
*Martin*, Richard 118—extent of his property 120.  
*Miracles* 486, 498.  
*Moirra House* 12.  
*Monasteries*, their property always coveted 57—all suppressed in Portugal 58—evil results of this 62—property of, how squandered by the spoilers 63—the income they rendered to the state 69.  
*Monastery* of Albocoa, its laxity 50—its former splendour ib.—its library 51—its appearance 52—devastated by the French army 55—its kitchen 53—comfort of its tenantry 67.  
*Monastery* of Capuchins, their excellence 54—of La Trappe at Staoheli 325.  
*Money*, immense sums of, lent to the Revolutionists of Portugal by English capitalists 61.  
*Monks*, good landlords and improvers of the country 66.  
*Moors* the, in Algeria 285.  
*Mozabites*, the race inhabiting Algeria 287.  
*Neville*, history of the House of 126.  
*Newland, Dr.*, his life of Antonio De Dominis 98—blunder about Bedell 102.  
*North, Mr.*, English Governor in Ceylon 465—his shameful intrigues ib.—his correspondence 467.  
*Oran*, road made from it to its harbour 305.  
*Otho*, King of Greece 85.  
*Palaeologi*, the last of the 130.  
*Papyri*, historical, first of the class 514—second Papyrus of the kings 515—Exodus Papyri 517.  
*Parliaments*, Irish 18.  
*Perkins*, the American, his account of the taking of Perugia 236—248.  
*Perugia*, the so-called massacre, compared with parallel cases in England 177—with the six-mile-bridge massacre 182—the Limerick massacre 185—tyranny under which the people of the town suffered 203—attack upon the town by the Papal troops 213—refutation of the calumnies upon that subject 228, 231.  
*Piracy* in Algeria 274.  
*Pius IX.*, Pope, secret intrigues against him 174—how encouraged 175—treatment of him by Napoleon 111, 191—at Perugia betrayed by the French and abandoned by the Austrians, 505—the Pope's allocution and remonstrances 198, 223.  
*Pombal*, his enmity to the Jesuits 47—effects of his system upon Portugal 49—evil influence upon the Church ibid.—his death 54.  
*Popes*, the, bound to defend their territories 17 right asserted by Popes Pius VII. and IX. 173—difficulties of their government 176.  
*Portugal*, brief sketch of her modern history 49, 55—Don Pedro placed upon the throne 56—suppression of the monasteries, 58—banishment of the Jesuits 59—the civil wars promoted by the money lenders in London 61—spoliation of Church property 63—ruin of the gentry and the peasants 65.  
*Portuguese* in Ceylon 456, 458.  
*Powell*, Rev. Baden, his "Unity of Worlds and of Nature" 470—denies the inspiration of the Bible ibid.—his views upon the attributes of God 471—upon miracles 472, 484—his opinions upon Scripture 478—of a future life 480—gets rid of the soul entirely 481—views upon the introduction of life 482—upon the death of Christ 490.  
*Precedents*, the English love of 115.  
*Presbyterians*, concessions they have obtained from the National Board of Education in Ireland 402, 404.  
*Protestants*, difficulties in their Christian belief 496—reject miracles 497.  
*Protestantism*, Dutch, its characteristics 446.  
*Pustocersk*, city of 343.  
*Quizote*, Don, his account of his imprisonment in Algeria 275.  
*Rescript*, Papal, of 1841, 358.  
*Revolutions* in France 292.  
*Road* between Blidah and Medeah 306.  
*Rosse*, Earl of, 28.  
*Rowan Hamilton*, publication of his trial 26.  
*Salmon*, in the Petschora 338.  
*Samejede*, the, nation on this side the Oural mountains 330—formerly visited by the English ibid.—geography of their territory 331—their drunkenness 333—first attempts at their conversion 334—mixture of idolatry with their religion 335—their marriage ceremonies 337 their sports 338—contest with bears 340—their last heathen temple destroyed by the missionaries 341—medical knowledge 342.  
*Santa Cruz*, convent of 69—its fall 70.  
*Sarsfield, Patrick*, Lord Mayor of Dublin 12.  
*Schools* in Algeria 298.  
 — non-vested in Ireland 380.  
 — conventional, discouraged by the National Board 381—their excellence ibid.—model, under the supreme control of the Board 386—character given to them by a Protestant 387—practical working of them described 389—receive boarders 390—model agricultural schools 393—character of books used in them 394—training schools for Catholics required in Ireland 436.  
*Schoolmasters*, many have left their faith 394.  
*Senior Mr.*, his account of Turkey 82, 93—extract from 87.  
*Sisters of charity* 298.  
*Society*, Church Education, content with the mixed system while they have it all their own way 430.  
*Stanley, Mr.*, his letter published in 1831, 363, 368, 370.  
*Stopford*, Archdeacon, 357, 369, 374—important alteration procured by him from the National School Board 376—attempted justification 411—his interpretation of the rights of parents 414—attributes underhand dealings to the Board 426.  
*Synod* of Thurles, its resolutions upon the National System of Education 357.

*Syracians*, Russian tribe 331—iniquitous dealings with the neighbouring Samojedes 332.  
*System*, mixed, of education 359—has two meanings 359.

*Tablet of Abydos* 512.

*Teachers*, Catholic, hardly dealt with by the National Board 400.

*Tennant*, Sir Emerson, his work on Ceylon 451.

*Teutich Ritters*, account of, by Carlyle 139.

*Theatre* in Fish-shamble street, Dublin 6.

*Times*, the newspaper, extracts from, shewing the real promoters of the Italian revolutions, 208—its false accounts of the taking of Perugia 217.

*Tipasa*, ancient church in Algeria 282.

*Troy*, siege of 95—its site 96.

*Tundras*, the Russian, appearance of 331.

*Turks*, the, what shall be done with them 78—their backwardness in civilization *ibid.*—their incapacity 79—owe their settlement in Europe to the Reformation 80—reasons why they are still suffered to continue in Europe 81—their present condition 82.

— in Algeria, expelled by the French 285.

*Turkey* in Europe, proposed division of the provinces 91.

*Uster*, National Schools there 398, 405.

*Union*, act of, debates upon 20.

*Unicors la*, its account of the re-taking of Perugia by the Pope 213.

*University of Coimbra* 49, 74.

*Veddahs*, the, 453.

*Waldemar the False*, story of 140.

*Wars*, European, principles upon which they are made 278.

*Wells*, Artesian, sunk by the French in Algeria 306.

*Werburgh St.*, Dublin 5.

*William III.*, his statue 15.

*Woodward*, Rev. Mr., his liberal views 372, 379, 409.

*Fakkini*, enchantress of ancient Ceylon 455.

*Zaonia*, religious university of the Kabyles, 290.

